

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. For the present the QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October; the times of publication of the REVIEW are variable.

The Classical Review

Editors { C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2
 R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

ALL COMMUNICATIONS intended for the Editors should be sent to MR. FORDYCE. BOOKS for review should be sent to the Publisher

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

PROF. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., F.E.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society
 J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (Hon. Treas.), PROF. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.,
 PROF. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A., F.S.A., F. H. SANDBACH, M.A. (Hon. Sec.), } Representing the Council of the
 PROF. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. } Classical Association
 J. D. DENNISTON, M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society

With the co-operation of
 PROF. J. L. MICHIE, University of Queensland, PROF. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and PROF. B. D. MERITT,
 Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

Volume LIX

DECEMBER 1945

Number 2

CONTENTS

NOTES AND NEWS	33
ARISTOPHANES, <i>FROGS</i> 1435-53. R. E. WYCHERLEY	34
THREE NOTES ON THE <i>ODYSSEY</i> . W. B. STANFORD	38
PHALARIS' BULL IN TIMAEUS. F. W. WALBANK	39
QUINTILIAN xii. 2. 28 and 31. R. G. AUSTIN	42
HORACE, <i>ODES</i> i. 28. 7-9. J. G. GRIFFITH	44
SOME CERTAIN OR POSSIBLE EXAMPLES OF LITERARY REMINIS- CENCE IN TACITUS. G. B. A. FLETCHER	45
PLINY ON THE SMARAGDUS. J. W. MEADOWS	50
BAD BRONZE AGAIN. T. A. SINCLAIR, D. E. EICHHOLZ	52
THE WHEEL AND THE CROWN. A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE	52
[THEOCRITUS], <i>ID.</i> xxiii. 53 f. A. S. F. GOW	53
MARCUS ANTONINUS vi. 13. E. R. DODDS	53
TWO NOTES ON PLOTINUS. R. G. BURY	53
REVIEWS:	
<i>Paideta</i> , II (Jaeger), J. TATE, 54; <i>Early Pythagorean Politics</i> (Minar), W. HAMILTON, 56; <i>Platon, Philèbe</i> (Diès), R. HACKFORTH, 57; <i>Études Plotiniennes</i> (Henry), C. JENKINS, 59; <i>The Meditations of the Emperor</i> <i>Marcus Antoninus</i> (Farquharson), J. H. SLEEMAN, 60; <i>Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity</i> (Knox), T. W. MANSON, 62; <i>Studien zu den Briefen des Hl. Basilios</i> (Cavallin), P. B. R. FORBES, 63; <i>What is</i> <i>a Classic?</i> (Eliot), M. R. RIDLEY, 64; <i>Fervigillum Veneris</i> (Schilling), C. CLEMENTI, 65; <i>Neue Senecastudien</i> (Arcebohn), G. B. A. FLETCHER, 66; <i>Sprachlicher und historischer Kommentar zu Ammianus Marcellinus</i> xiv. 7-11 (de Jonge), G. B. A. FLETCHER, 67; <i>Studies in Greek Genealogical Chronology</i> (Prakken), A. W. GOMME, 69; <i>A History of Rome to 565 A.D.</i> (Boak), A. F. GILES, 70; <i>Kouroi</i> (Richter), J. D. BEAZLEY, 71; <i>Roman Medallions</i> (Toynbee), C. H. V. SUTHERLAND, 73; <i>Michigan Papyri V</i> , VI, H. I. BELL, 74; <i>Yale</i> <i>Classical Studies</i> , VIII, J. TATE, 76; <i>Philological Studies in Honor of Walter Miller</i> , G. B. A. FLETCHER, 77; <i>The Golden Fleece</i> (Graves), J. R. BACON, 78.	
SHORT REVIEWS	79
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	82
BOOKS RECEIVED	84

OXFORD : AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO, AND MELBOURNE : GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE

Price 6s. 6d. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$2.55. Combined yearly subscription for the
 CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$5.32

Entered as Second Class at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3. 15s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s.; combined subscription £1. 1s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Miss E. C. Gedge, Westfield College, London, N.W. 3. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Mr. J. J. R. Bridge, Mutcombe, Fairfield Road, Bath, and Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

l
r
d
n
d
al

C.
ne
h,
of
bl,
er,
d,

T

A
Re
cia
15
30
do
sic
ha
wi
by
co
se
Cl
H
th
ra
te
br
fr
al
on
(F
sic
fe
M
'T
th
de
on
P
M
di
in
on
M
of
B
F
R
A
'S
P
G
be
cl
'T
H
A
by

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

DECEMBER 1945

NOTES AND NEWS

A JOINT Meeting of the Hellenic and Roman Societies and the Classical Association was held at Cambridge from 8 to 15 August. The large attendance of over 300 showed that war-time conditions had done little to weaken the vitality of classical studies in this country, while the happy renewal of freer communication with other European nations was marked by the presence of some distinguished continental scholars. At the opening session in the Regent House the Vice-Chancellor of the University (Dr. T. S. Hele) welcomed the members of the three societies. Professor Gilbert Murray, O.M., in returning thanks, read out telegrams of greetings from the Sydney branch of the Classical Association and from a group of scholars in the U.S.A. He also introduced the guests from abroad, on behalf of whom Professor A. Diès (France) returned thanks. At later sessions the following read papers: Professor R. A. B. Mynors on 'A Cambridge Manuscript of Cicero'; Mr. M. N. Tod on 'The Progress of Greek Epigraphy during the War'; Dr. J. T. Sheppard on 'The Wisdom of Sophocles'; Mr. L. P. Wilkinson on 'The Intention of Virgil's *Georgics*'; Professor C. J. Fordyce on 'Catullus'; Mr. I. A. Richmond on 'Some Immediate Problems of Post-War Research in Britain'; Professor H. T. Wade-Gery on 'The Date of Homer and Hesiod'; Mr. Ronald Syme on 'Livy on the Reign of Augustus' (after which Professor J. Bayet spoke on classical studies in France during the war); Professor H. J. Rose on 'Theology and Mythology in Aeschylus'; Mrs. M. I. Henderson on 'Some Questions about Julius Caesar'; Professor D. S. Robertson on 'The Greatness of Pindar'; Dr. V. L. Ehrenberg on '"Unwritten Laws" in Periclean Athens'; Mr. F. H. Sandbach on 'The Schooling of Zeno'; and Professor H. D. F. Kitto on 'Dramatic Texture in Aeschylus'. Lantern lectures were given by Mr. R. Meiggs on 'Ostia in the Second

Century A.D.'; Miss J. M. C. Toynbee on 'Beasts and their Names in the Roman Empire'; and Professor A. W. Lawrence on 'The Development of Greek Sculpture'. Discussions were held on 'Research in Early Fenland History', the speakers being Dr. H. Godwin, Mr. C. F. C. Hawkes, and Mr. E. J. Rudsdale, with Dr. H. C. Darby as chairman, and on 'Political and Intellectual Freedom in the Ancient World', for which the chair was taken by Sir Ernest Barker and the speakers included Professor B. Farrington, Mr. A. W. Gomme, and Professor F. E. Adcock. Ely Cathedral was visited under the expert guidance of the Dean of Ely (the Very Rev. L. E. Blackburne). A tea-party was held in the Dining Hall and Fellows' Garden of King's College. There were exhibitions, at the Fitzwilliam Museum and St. John's and Corpus Christi Colleges, of coins, manuscripts, and early printed books. Newnham and Girton Colleges provided accommodation for about half the number of those attending the whole meeting.

For the final session the Master of St. John's College (Mr. E. A. Benians) received the members in the Combination Room. Professor J. Cousin (France) and Professor P. Lambrechts (Belgium) also spoke. After Professor Kitto's paper, Dr. H. I. Bell (President of the Roman Society) brought the proceedings to a close, with a speech in which he considered the meaning and value of classical studies in the world of to-day and proposed a vote of thanks to all who had been responsible for the arrangements of the meeting, particularly Miss M. V. Taylor, who planned the original Joint Meeting of the Hellenic and Roman Societies at Oxford in 1942 as an experiment. She is to be congratulated again on having instigated a most successful second Joint Meeting.

THE 'Books Received' columns of this number of *C.R.* contain a feature which

every reader will welcome; after a break of more than five years France is represented again. During the years of occupation French scholarship was not idle, and, despite the difficulties which still beset the interchange of books between allied countries, some of the evidence is now before us. These books will be reviewed here as soon as may be; in the meantime attention may be drawn to two of them. One is the *Mémorial des Études Latines* which in 1943 the members of the Société des Études Latines offered, in commemoration of the twentieth year of the Society and its journal, to Professor Jules Marouzeau of the University of Paris, whose enthusiasm brought both into existence and whose wise direction and untiring devotion have brought to both their success. The *Mémorial* consists of some

forty chapters in which the several departments of Latin studies—philology, metric, stylistic, literature, classical and medieval, history, archaeology, law, religion, epigraphy, palaeography—are surveyed by specialists who aim 'à présenter l'état des principales questions qui ont retenu l'attention des travailleurs, à signaler celles qui demandent examen, à suggérer les recherches nécessaires, les méthodes utiles, les conclusions possibles'. The volume is worthy of the occasion and of the recipient; to him and to the *Revue des Études Latines* we offer our belated congratulations. The other is the Bibliography of Latin Literature of Professor N. I. Herescu, which was published in the same year—a most useful and reliable work of reference, critically compiled and admirably arranged.

ARISTOPHANES, *FROGS*, 1435-53.

- (ΔΙ.) ἀλλ' ἔτι μίαν γνώμην ἑκάτερος εἶπατον 1435
περὶ τῆς πόλεως ἦντιν' ἔχοντο σωτηρίαν.
ΕΥ. εἰ τις πτερώσας Κλεόκριτον Κινησίαν,
αἶρουεν αἶθρα πελαγίαν ὑπὲρ πλάκα.
ΔΙ. γέλοιον ἂν φαίνοντο· νοῦν δ' ἔχει τίνα;
ΕΥ. εἰ ναυμαχοῖεν, κῆρ' ἔχοντες ὀξίδας 1440
βαλνοῖεν ἐς τὰ βλέφαρα τῶν ἐναντίων.
ΔΙ. λέγε.
ΕΥ. ὅταν τὰ νῦν ἄπιστα πῶσθ' ἡγώμεθα,
τὰ δ' ὅτα πῶσθ' ἄπιστα.
ΔΙ. πῶς; οὐ μανθάνω.
ἀμαθέστερόν πως εἶπε καὶ σαφέστερον. 1445
ΕΥ. εἰ τῶν πολιτῶν οἷσι νῦν πιστεύομεν,
τούτοις ἀπιστήσομαι, οἷς δ' οὐ χρώμεθα,
τούτοις χρησάμεθα, σωθείημεν ἂν.
εἰ νῦν γε δυστυχοῦμεν ἐν τούτοις, πῶς 1450
τὰναντία πράξαντες οὐ σφισοίμεθ' ἂν;
ΔΙ. εὖ γ', ὦ Παλάμηδες, ὦ σοφωτάτῃ φύσει.
ταυτὶ πότερ' αὐτὸς εὖρες ἢ Κηφισοφῶν.
ΕΥ. ἐγὼ μόνος· τὰς δ' ὀξίδας Κηφισοφῶν.

We are told by the scholiast that Aristarchus rejected lines 1437-41 because they are φορτικώτεροι καὶ εὐτελεῖς, Apollonius because οὐ πρὸς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἔχουσί τι; 1452 also, which takes with it 1453 and possibly 1451, was not allowed to remain. Nearly all modern editors have followed the ancient critics' lead and refused to let the passage stand intact. Merry did not think it advisable to make any more drastic change than the transference of 1439 to a place immediately after 1441 (though even this he did not find inevitable; the abruptness of 1442 may 'mark the transition

from nonsense to oracular obscurity').¹ But since his mild defence the passage has been severely handled again by many editors, including van Leeuwen, Rogers, Tucker, and especially Radermacher. Apart from certain particular difficulties the general objection to it is that it is an intolerable hotch-potch, containing either interpolations from another source or two Aristophanic versions mixed; and the object of the editors has been to produce a version (if not two)² which is more consistent and dramatically more satisfying. I do not think a sufficiently persistent attempt has been made to extract good sense from the lines—that is, good dramatic sense—as they stand in our text.

Certain special difficulties must be faced first. The syntax of lines 1437 and 1438 is certainly very remarkable; but this is not usually considered as serious;

¹ I should say rather 'sophistic ambiguity'. Green, too, thinks that this transposition might solve the difficulty. But it is not altogether satisfactory; one would expect to find 1442 followed by further explanation of the Cleocritus-Cinesias device.

² Tucker (p. 78) and Radermacher (p. 346) having disentangled alternative versions set them out clearly side by side.

¹ e.g. T. quoted are the personative participle of the whole here, but a to by τις whole sche

the editors quote plenty of parallels.¹ One might go further and ask whether the bad syntax is not dramatically sound. Euripides trips up in his excessive anxiety to get a prompt hearing for his brain-wave. For that reason, though it is easily done, it is perhaps a pity to emend away the bad grammar.

The abruptness and apparent incongruity of 1442 raises a more serious objection, an objection which some editors find fatal in itself to the retention of the passage as it stands. Radermacher says,² 'Vor allem 1442 verträgt sich in keiner Weise mit dem Vorhergehenden'; and again, '1442 ist allerdings unmöglich, wenn Euripides schon einen Vorschlag gemacht hat'. But we can imagine Euripides stopping at 1441, pulling himself together, and making a fresh start. Certainly the transition at 1442 is extremely abrupt and awkward, *as we read it, without pause*; but Aristophanes did not write for us to read but for the Athenians in the theatre to hear and respond. If we try to imagine what the response of the audience would be, the difficulty of 1442 is not so great. Cinesias' flightiness and Euripides' perverse ingenuity were never-failing sources of mirth; and Euripides' New Weapon is highly comical, or at least would be thought so by a large part of the audience, even if Aristarchus was not amused. We can assume a break after 1441 until that laughter has died down; then Euripides begins again in a more serious tone—'I know, and I'll tell you. . .'. I do not know of any precise parallel for this kind of thing; but I submit that it is not impossible; in any case I would rather take this view, or in the last resort accept the awkwardness of 1442 without any excuse or palliative, than mutilate or manipulate lines which present no other serious difficulty and which, I believe, contain a good piece

of Aristophanic comedy-writing and would be seriously weakened by the proposed curtailments. If one *must* assume an interpolation, then the interpolator was Aristophanes, who inserted 1437-41 (with 1451-3) at a late stage, somewhat carelessly perhaps, but with good general effect.

1437-41 are good comic and even Aristophanic lines; it is sometimes assumed that they belong to the other edition of the *Frogs* or to another contemporary comedy such as Eupolis' *Demoi*. Such Heath-Robinson devices are thoroughly Aristophanic; one may compare *Acharnians* 920 ff. Fanciful schemes for turning the scales of war, now inclining against Athens, may well have been in the air in the closing phase of the Peloponnesian War; the war was a time of experiment in military matters; and we know how men's thoughts turn to new and devastating weapons when victory eludes them. Aristophanes may have been poking fun at this kind of thing, as well as at Cinesias and Euripides.

The question is—is the fun out of place here? One might argue that Aristophanes requires a little comic relief for the serious political advice which makes up this scene; also that he likes to put his audience in a good humour by a piece of broad farce when he wants to lay before them some idea which is likely to meet with opposition and give offence; he uses this method on a big scale in the *Acharnians*.

Apart from line 1442, the transition from comic to serious is not entirely abrupt, but is skilfully effected by 1443-4, in which Euripides, though giving genuine political advice, still uses language which is highly comical; how comical it is we hardly see when we read the lines in our texts with the words clearly set out. The lines must be spoken, and spoken rapidly, to get the effect which Aristophanes calculated; they then become a bewildering and ambiguous jumble, as Tucker points out.¹ Thus if we retain the passage

¹ e.g. Tucker on 1437 (his 1438). The examples quoted are mostly not so startling as this. Usually the person referred to in the unattached nominative participle can be regarded as the logical subject of the whole sentence; this is not quite the case here, but at least the hypothetical inventor referred to by τῆς can be regarded as the author of the whole scheme.

² p. 343.

¹ Blaydes, on 1444, says 'Μαλὶν τὰ νῦν δὲ πλοῦς'; this makes the sense clearer and spoils the point.

intact we have not simply Euripides' two pieces of advice side by side in startling contrast; there are rather three phases, sheer farce, serious thought and farcical language, serious thought and serious language.

Finally, Euripides has done with his tricks and sophistries and makes his real suggestion for the safety of the city in simple language. Even 1446-50 are not allowed to stand intact; a number of editors, including van Leeuwen, eject 1449-50. σωζοίμεθ' ἄν is not very happy after σωθείημεν ἄν (or ἴσως σωθείημεν ἄν); but the lines are not mere padding or repetition, and something is lost by omitting them. 1446-8 explain what Euripides' idea is; 1449-50 demonstrate why it is bound to succeed.

The plausibility and slickness of the demonstration help to give point to line 1451 in its present place. Usually, of course, it is argued that 1451-3 follow much more aptly after 1441. In one point they do not. Dionysus says, 'Did you discover this yourself or did Cephisophon?' Euripides replies, 'I alone'; but Cephisophon discovered the vinegar-bottles.' The vinegar-bottles are an essential part of the 'secret weapon', and Euripides is contradicting himself if he is only referring to 1437-41. After 1450 his remark is more simple and natural: 'The idea of changing leaders is entirely mine; the gadget I described just now (or a helpful suggestion for it) I owe to Cephisophon.'

It is remarkable that the political advice which Euripides gives in the end is something of which Aristophanes himself approves. Euripides' words are still irritatingly vague, but after 717-37 there can be no doubt what the meaning is—the Athenians must throw over the new demagogic leaders such as Cleophon who had recently persuaded them to reject a reasonable peace, and put in their place more moderate statesmen who would follow a safer policy. This was Aristophanes' own view. Politics play a minor rôle in the *Frogs*, but Aristophanes still feels strongly on some points, and the closing lines of the play show that his feelings are the same as

ever.¹ The close correspondence between Euripides' words and the *ant-epirrhemata* (717-37), in which Aristophanes is presumably speaking for himself, is obvious; but the peculiarity of the coincidence deserves more careful examination.

To the other test question, too, Aristophanes gives Euripides an answer which, though evasive about Alcibiades, contains sound political sentiments, fully in accord with his own; Aristophanes also hated those who neglected or damaged their city's interests and feathered their own nests. Euripides is usually thought of as one of Aristophanes' pet aversions, as a leading representative of the dangerous and subversive modern spirit. Yet here we find him credited with very reasonable political advice, conservative in tone. He might easily have been assigned some outrageous and discreditable suggestion, but he is spared.

Aristophanes' attitude to Euripides is not clear-cut and simple; it is not merely dislike and disapproval; and the *Frogs*—even the second half—is no mere attack on Euripides but a hard-fought contest in which Euripides gives a good account of himself and Aeschylus is roughly handled, not merely by Euripides but by Aristophanes, before he emerges as victor. Euripides holds his own to the end, and not least in the present scene, the test of political wisdom; it is in more farcical scenes such as the *lekkythion* episode that Aeschylus scores most decisively. No part of the contest is more vital than 905-1097, and there too Euripides is allowed to make some good points.²

¹ While admitting the need for Mr. Gomme's warning (*C.R.* lii. 97) against attaching too much importance to Aristophanes' own political views in the appreciation of the comedies, I do not agree that on the subject of war and warmongers his views are dramatically unimportant, or that he is primarily dramatizing current feelings among different sections of the community, rather than consistently promoting an anti-war policy. I feel that Aristophanes' own voice can often be heard speaking through the mouth of Dicaeopolis, and that lines such as *Ach.* 979 express his fixed attitude to war.

² It is a welcome change to find that Norwood (*Greek Comedy*, p. 260) calls 959 ff. a 'magnificent

A
first
—a
ged
opin
thin
can
thou
grea
perh
faul
but
plan
were
dead
scen
ting
pides
not
sion
Arist
beau
his i
entire
doub
trage
phanc
forma
(1009,
beaut
from
case c
influe
gives
better
the p
in fet
that h
save
of pea
he say
after
himself
Aeschyl
Arist
a big
cuss it
the sco
to pro
are of
irritate
him de
descripti
pides say
demning

Aristophanes was perhaps among the first to recognize in Euripides the third—and last—great genius in Attic tragedy. The Athenian public, whose opinions the judges reflected, did not think of him as such in his lifetime. It can hardly be denied that Aristophanes thought of and treated Euripides as a great poet—a great poet gone wrong, perhaps, or at least marred by serious faults and guilty of startling lapses—but still on an incomparably higher plane than the miserable twitterers who were left when he and Sophocles were dead. This is made clear in the opening scene of the *Frogs* (92). But in admitting that Aristophanes thought Euripides a real and a great poet, it must not be forgotten what such an admission implies. One cannot say that Aristophanes was fascinated by the beauty of Euripides' poetry but found his ideas all wrong or his influence entirely bad. The distinction is a doubtful one in dealing with Greek tragedy and quite false as far as Aristophanes is concerned. The criteria are formally and plainly stated in the *Frogs* (1009, 1055): a poet's work should have beauty as a matter of course; but apart from the skill of his art (which in any case cannot be kept distinct from moral influence) we praise him because he gives good advice and makes the citizens better; all parties to the contest accept the principle. One of Dionysus' aims in fetching back a poet from Hades is that his good counsel and influence may save Athens and restore the blessings of peace, symbolized by the festivals; he says so at the very moment when, after exhaustive trials, he declares himself still unable to decide between Aeschylus and Euripides (1411, 1419).

Aristophanes' opinion of Euripides is a big and complicated subject; to discuss it further would be to go beyond the scope of this note. I merely wish to protest that Aristophanes' feelings are often over-simplified. Euripides irritated Aristophanes but also affected him deeply, as is shown by the peculiar

description of realism'; too often, whatever Euripides says in the *Frogs*, he is assumed to be condemning himself out of his own mouth.

intimacy of Aristophanes' acquaintance with the plays. The elements which he found amusing or exasperating or alarming stand out—admittedly in very high relief—against the background of his realization of Euripides' greatness. To return to political views—Aristophanes and Euripides from different directions and by different paths came very close at some points. The views of his own which Aristophanes puts in Euripides' mouth can be extracted from Euripides' plays too. Euripides, like Aristophanes, believed in democracy though he saw its abuses and dangers; and he thought moderation best and condemned excess.¹ But it is on the subject of war²—and of the war—that Euripides must have aroused in Aristophanes a keen sympathy. A play such as the *Troades*, showing the futility of a war which meant degradation and calamity for the victors as well as misery for the vanquished, and reflecting on the brutally aggressive spirit of Athens, must have moved Aristophanes profoundly. It is quite legitimate that for comic effect on the stage Aristophanes should concentrate on Euripides' lapses and his tricks and sophistries which degraded the tragic art; his recognition of Euripides' good points and of his greatness and *rightness* shows itself here and there, as in this passage, and is also implied by Dionysus' quest and by Euripides' position as a redoubtable challenger of Aeschylus.

But what has all this to do with Cinesias and the vinegar bottles? And if this view is sound, does it not provide

¹ *Supplices*, 244, τριῶν δὲ μοιρῶν ἡ'ν μέσῳ σώζει πόλεις. I have not overlooked the great difficulty of extracting a dramatist's political—or any other—views from his plays. The principles on which it can be done are expounded and applied to Euripides by, e.g., P. Decharme, *Euripide et l'Esprit de son Théâtre*, pp. 25 ff. (translation by J. Loeb, pp. 19, 20); R. B. Appleton, *E. the Idealist*, p. xiv.

² Euripides emphasizes the horrors of war rather than the blessings of peace which Aristophanes dangles before his countrymen's eyes; but what could Aristophanes find more sympathetic than the beautiful peace fragment from the *Cresphontes*, Εἰρήνη βαθύνουτε κτλ. See Nauck, *Trag. Graec. Frag.* (1889) 453; note especially the emphasis on festivals—καλλιχόρους δοῖδας φιλοστεφάνους τε κάμους.

an argument *against* retaining the Cinesias passage in its present position? If Aristophanes is doing less injustice than elsewhere to Euripides, and giving him credit for certain sound political opinions, are not lines 1437-41 more incongruous than ever beside 1443-50? On the contrary the incongruity is deliberate and significant; it is typical of the incongruities which Aristophanes found in Euripides himself, and sums up his conception of Euripides as a genuine poet who had much that was right and salutary to say, but whose art was marred and whose ideas were perverted by subtleties and sophistries and trivialities. Radermacher 'improves' this scene by retaining Cinesias and bracketing 1442-50 (just below he brackets 1459-66 too). 'Was dann noch bleibt, zeigt einen scharfen Gegensatz zwischen der etwas läppischen Weise des Euripides und dem Ernst des Äschylus; dies dürfte den Absichten des Aristophanes am ersten entsprechen.' The most ingenious editor could not cut out sufficient lines to make Aeschylus serious and Euripides entirely flippant, without reducing the play to a series of disjointed fragments. Radermacher suspects 1459 because the language does not suit Aeschylus, 'wenn anders er mit voller Würde spricht'. Is the *lekythion* business appropriate to Aeschylus, or the verbal quibbles of 1163, 1183, etc.? Aristophanes' Aeschylus is one of his

most comical figures; and he takes some really hard knocks too;¹ but that is not to say that Aristophanes did not love and admire Aeschylus deeply. Similarly his feelings towards Euripides were mixed, even if the ingredients and proportions were different; and one should not tamper with this scene to simplify them.

The retention of lines 1437-53 as they stand does not depend on the correctness of the view outlined above of Aristophanes' attitude to Euripides. I find the lines intelligible and dramatically effective, and prefer to believe that Aristophanes wrote them just as we have them, rather than that they took shape through any of the none too simple or explicable processes of interpolation or contamination suggested by editors. The truth about Aristophanes and Euripides is elusive; but at least I am convinced that Aristophanes' sentiments are curiously complex; and perhaps one should see in these lines a reflection of that complexity.

R. E. WYCHERLEY.

University College, Bangor.

¹ The sabre-rattling type ascribed to Aeschylus' influence in 1016 is hardly one which Aristophanes admires; not to speak of Lamachus (1039). Yet Aeschylus is sometimes treated as if he were the mouthpiece of Aristophanes himself; words spoken by him in rage or blind prejudice are quoted, out of their context, as if they were the considered judgements of Aristophanes; this is very unjust to Aristophanes.

THREE NOTES ON THE ODYSSEY

(1) *Od.* viii. 167-8

οὕτως οὐ πάντεσσι θεοὶ χαρίεντα δίδουσι
ἀνδράσιν.

Ludwich cites Nauck: '*vix integer; quid requiratur, docet Δ 320*' [ἀλλ' οὐ πως ἅμα πάντα θεοὶ δόσαν ἀνθρώποισιν]. I suggest πάντ' ἴσα (= ἴσως) for πάντεσσι—'So the gods do not give all graceful gifts alike to men.' For the neglect of the digamma in ἴσος cf. *Il.* xi. 705; xxiii. 736; *Od.* ii. 203; ix. 42, 549; x. 378.

(2) *Od.* x. 554-5 (describing Elpenor on the roof)

ὅς μοι ἀνενθ' ἐτάρων ἱεροῖς ἐν δώμασι Κίρκης,
ψύχεος ἱμέρων, κατελέγato οἶνοβαρείων.

Read ἂν δώμασι, cf. Aristarchus' ἅμ πέτρῃσι for ἐν πέτρῃσι at *Od.* v. 156 (= Aeschylus *Suppl.* 351). The change is more necessary here, as otherwise there is no explicit statement that Elpenor was on the roof till he has fallen off it. The combination of both apocope and the rare use of ἀνά with the dative was almost bound to cause corruption. It does so at *Il.* viii. 441 ἀμβλώνεσσι etc. for ἅμ βωμοῖσι; cf. *Od.* xxiv. 8 ἅμα τ' ἀλλήλησιν for ἀνά τ' ἀλλήλησιν.

(3) After *Od.* xii. 133 several respectable MSS. insert a remarkable three-word hexameter. Allen quotes it as

αὐτοκασιγνήτη Θέτιδος λιπαροκρηδέμου

but
Lee

I ha
any
pre
sum
read

T
I ha
Gre
Il. i
and
31,

1
ἀμφι

P

Wh
thag
spoi
to h
whic
ferre
Agri
bene
clud
the
orati
how
suita
prese
cae c
The
Diod
Pliny

Th
discu
Tima

1 Di
2 Di

την ἐπι

3 Di

4 Sc

and w

Eutrop

200 B

85, 86;

6 Di

γραφομ

7 Pl

causa s

quis ill

8 Po

μέρος δ

but Ludwich, Merry, Pierron, van Leeuwen-da Costa, and others, as

αὐτοκασιγνήτη Θέτιδος λιπαροπλοκάμιοι.

I have not been able to check this with any MSS. But since Allen ignores his predecessors' unanimous version I presume he has made a slip. Can any reader verify this?

Three-word hexameters are very rare. I have found only six others in earlier Greek (to the end of the fifth century): *Il.* ii. 706; *Od.* x. 137; Hesiod, *Works* 383 and fr. 278, 4 (Rzach), *Hymn to Demeter* 31, *Hymn to Artemis* (xxvii) 3.¹ All

¹ Naeke's emendation of *Asius* fr. 13, 7 (Kinkel), ἀμφιβραχιονίσαντες ὑπασπίδιον πολεμιστήν, which he

these, except the first in Hesiod, begin with a compound of -κασιγνήτος, -η (αὐτο- in all except *Demeter* 31, which has πατρο-), reaching to the penthemimeral caesura; the rest of the line varies freely in each case. But *Works* 383

Πληιάδων Ἀτλαγενέων ἐπιτελλομένων

is unique in form, the longest word being at the end of the line. It is quoted in the *Contest of Homer and Hesiod* (Rzach 170).

W. B. STANFORD.

Trinity College, Dublin.

calls 'iocosa Asti magniloquentia dignissimum', is improbable.

PHALARIS' BULL IN TIMAEUS (DIOD. SIC. xiii. 90. 4-7).

WHEN Scipio Aemilianus sacked Carthage in 146 B.C. he found among the spoils a brazen bull,¹ generally believed to be the notorious bull of Phalaris, which (it was alleged) had been transferred to Carthage² when Himilco took Agrigentum in 406 B.C.³ Scipio's many benefactions to the cities of Sicily⁴ included the restoration of this bull to the Agrigentines; and in his second oration against Verres⁵ Cicero describes how the Roman commander added the suitable injunction that it should be preserved as a *monumentum et domesticae crudelitatis et nostrae mansuetudinis*. The bull was still at Agrigentum in Diodorus' own time,⁶ and possibly in Pliny's.⁷

The authenticity of Phalaris' bull was discussed critically and lengthily by Timaeus,⁸ but his remarks are known

to us only from a scholiast on Pindar, *Pythians*, i. 185, and from the criticisms of Polybius and Diodorus.¹ It is with the relationship between the two latter that this note is concerned.

Timaeus is reported to have stated that:

- (a) The real bull was sunk in the sea by the people of Agrigentum after Phalaris' death (Schol.).
- (b) A bull which was displayed at Agrigentum in Timaeus' own time (4th-3rd cent.) in fact represented the river Gela (Schol.).
- (c) The bull at Carthage was not from Agrigentum (Polyb.).
- (d) There had never been such a bull as that of Phalaris at Agrigentum (Polyb. and Diod.).

Of these statements clearly (a) and (d) are inconsistent;² what Timaeus really

¹ Diod. xiii. 90. 5, xxxii. 25; Cic. *Verr.* ii. 4. 73.

² Diod. xiii. 90. 4; cf. Polyb. xii. 25. 3: κατὰ τὴν ἐπικράτειαν Καρχηδονίων.

³ Diod. *ibid.*; Xen. *Hell.* i. 5. 21.

⁴ Scipio's beneficence made a great impression and was widely celebrated: cf. Livy, *ep.* 51; Eutrop. iv. 12. 2; App. *Pun.* 133; Plut. *Moral.* 200 B (*Apophtheg. Scip.* Min. 6); Cic. *Verr.* ii. 2. 3, 85, 86; 4. 93, and *passim*. ⁵ Cic. *Verr.* ii. 4. 73.

⁶ Diod. xiii. 90. 5: δὲ καὶ τῶνδε τῶν ἱστοριῶν γραφομένων ἦν ἐν Ἀκράγαντι.

⁷ Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxxiv. 89: 'itaque una de causa servantur opera eius (i.e. the bull), ut quisquis illa videat, oderit manus'.

⁸ Polyb. xii. 25. 5: πολλοὺς δὲ τινὰς εἰς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος διατίθεται λόγους.

¹ Polyb. xii. 25; Diod. xiii. 90. 4-7.

² Not so (b) and (c); yet Freeman, *History of Sicily*, ii (1891), 463, argues, rather curiously, that from the scholiast's statement on the identity of the bull at Agrigentum 'it would seem that Timaios neither denied the existence of Phalaris' bull nor said anything about any bull at Carthage'. This well illustrates the dangers of the *argumentum ex silentio*. Freeman also discusses whether Polybius believed the bull at Carthage to have been identical with that which Timaeus knew of at Agrigentum (i.e. that representing the river god Gela); and, as he sees, Polybius' phraseology (n. 2 above) does not exclude that view, since 'during the Carthaginian domination' could cover any time down to the First Punic War. But

said has been misunderstood either by the scholiast or by Polybius and Diodorus. And since the scholiast's statement is quite precise and clear, and not of the kind on which one would be likely to go wrong,¹ there is a strong argument for accepting Lenschau's suggestion² that the two historians have misunderstood Timaeus, who in fact said that there was no such bull as that of Phalaris at Agrigentum at the time of the Carthaginian domination.

This suggestion, though very plausible, raises, however, the question of the relationship between Polybius and Diodorus in these passages. The general assumption³ has been that because Diodorus is criticizing Timaeus he must be copying Polybius; and this belief has been associated with a persistent confusion as to what Polybius, xii. 25, actually says. Lenschau, for example (to quote the most recent offender), asserts that Polybius and Diodorus rely on Scipio's recovery of the bull to refute Timaeus. Bentley and Freeman said the same;⁴ but as far as Polybius is

Freeman also sees that such a bull would hardly have had a joint at the shoulder. His solution that the Carthaginians with true Punic duplicity constructed a second bull for the Graeco-Roman tourist traffic is hardly to be taken seriously.

¹ So Freeman, loc. cit., rightly, against Bentley, *Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris* (1699), 512.

² P.-W. (1938), s.v. 'Phalaris', col. 1650. Lenschau's Diodorus reference must be corrected from xx. 71 to xiii. 90. 5.

³ See, besides Lenschau, C. Clasen, *Timaíos v. Tauromenion* (Kiel, 1883), 25, n. 1; E. Schwartz, P.-W., s.v. 'Diodoros (37)', col. 686: 'xiv (read xiii). 90. 5-7 ist Einlage aus Polybios (xii. 25)'.

⁴ Bentley, op. cit. 511: 'The sole argument that they (i.e. Polybius and Diodorus) go upon is a Brazen Bull that Scipio found in Carthage', etc.; nor is this merely loose writing: cf. p. 514: 'For he (i.e. Lucian) might read in Polybius and Diodorus, whose passages have been cited above, that the very bull was found at Carthage and restored to the Agrigentines by Scipio's order.' And so the bad tradition was established. Thus Freeman, op. cit. ii. 462, writes that Polybius 'describes Timaios as denying that the bull brought from Carthage was the genuine bull of Phalaris'. 'He himself (i.e. Polybius) argues that the bull brought from Carthage was genuine.' On p. 463 again it is 'Scipio's bull'. The same error had already appeared in Clasen, loc. cit.: 'Polybius führt nun zur Widerlegung des Timaios an, dass der eiserne Stier später von Scipio wieder nach Akragas gebracht sei.' Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.* I², 422, n. 4 repeats it, quoting Clasen;

concerned, it is quite untrue. Diodorus and Polybius both attack Timaeus for denying that the original bull was taken from Agrigentum to Carthage, but they use quite distinct arguments. Whereas to Diodorus the refutation of Timaeus comes at the hands of fortune (*Τίμαιος . . . ὅπ' αὐτῆς τῆς τύχης ἠλέγχθη*) in the mere production and restoration of the bull to Agrigentum, it is precisely the authenticity of this Carthaginian bull which Polybius finds it necessary to defend. Timaeus had denied that it came from Agrigentum; in that case, argues Polybius, why did the Carthaginians manufacture it? And what of the joint at the shoulder-blade through which the victims were let down?⁵

It is noteworthy that Polybius makes no reference in this chapter to Scipio's recovery of the bull, and that for the very good reason that when he wrote Book XII it had not yet taken place. Polybius' silence on an event of 146 B.C. is consistent with the *communis opinio*² that Book XII was composed before 150 B.C.; indeed it affords that theory additional support against Laqueur's hypothesis that the criticism of Timaeus belonged to a late, fifth, edition of the *Histories*, along with all references involving the notion of world-history, Stoicism, and a didactic-utilitarian approach.³ For while it is true that logically Polybius, seeing that the restoration of the bull to Agrigentum was irrelevant to the question of its authenticity, might therefore have omitted to mention it, it must be obvious to anyone familiar with Polybius' personality and

and Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. des Altert.* iii² (1937), 632, is on the kindest interpretation ambiguous. This misunderstanding of what Polybius said in xii. 25 seems to have preceded the assumption that Diodorus xiii. 90. 4-7 drew directly on this passage; for neither Bentley nor Freeman expresses any opinion on the relation between the two historians.

² Polyb. xii. 25. 3.

³ Cf. Thommen, *Hermes*, xx (1885), 221; Strachan-Davidson, *Selections from Polybius*, 647; K. Svoboda, *Philol.* lxxii (1913), 483; De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani*, iii. 1. 203.

⁴ R. Laqueur, *Polybios* (1913), 259. But, as I have argued elsewhere (*C.Q.*, xxxix (1945), 14, n. 5), in his recent P.-W. article on Philinus Laqueur has already surrendered his position and must logically recast his scheme.

litera
have
to th
and p
magn
least
passa
be de
occu

It
argu
an im
over-
appe
As he
have
Phala
digre
ture
Poly
for (a
tence
exhib
comb
own
refut
read
turne
seen
could
the s

Th
recol
speci
exam
rians,

¹ Th
descri
25; an
that h
from F
such a
omitte
Valesi

² Di
said th
have n
Polybi
of the
was in
1-11 h
in 264
sana b
in turn
him ma
this wa
Beloch
cit. iii.

literary technique that he could not have let pass such a chance of referring to the generosity of his friend, pupil, and patron, and to events *quorum pars magna fuit*, or that he would at the very least have referred forward to the later passage in which these things were to be described, had they in fact already occurred.¹

It follows, then, that to describe the argument of Diodorus xiii. 90. 4-6 as an insertion from Polybius xii. 25 is an over-simplification. Its origin would appear to have been rather as follows. As he excerpted Timaeus, Diodorus will have come upon the discussion on Phalaris' bull, probably as a polemical digression consequent on Himilco's capture of Agrigentum. Remembering that Polybius had inveighed against Timaeus for (allegedly) denying the bull's existence, and knowing that a bull was still exhibited at Agrigentum, he apparently combined the two facts to produce his own original (if naïve and unconvincing) refutation of Timaeus' theory. Had he read Timaeus more carefully or even turned up Polybius xii, he must have seen that the restoration of the bull could not affect Timaeus' argument in the slightest.²

That Diodorus was drawing on general recollections of Polybius and not on one specific passage is confirmed by a closer examination of his argument. Historians, he says, who sin in ignorance

deserve pardon, whereas those whom bitterness or the desire to curry favour leads to deliberate inaccuracy merit the most unrelenting condemnation. This is pure—and well-worn—Polybius, but it does not occur in xii. 25; it is in fact a *communis locus*, which Polybius expounds, not only in xii. 7. 6 (cf. 12. 4), a passage to which Diodorus provides verbal parallels—ἀγνοήμασι (Diod.), κατ' ἀγνοίαν (Pol.); συγγνώμης (Diod.), συγγνώμην (Pol.); κατὰ προαίρεσιν (Diod., Pol.); κατηγορίας (Diod.), κατηγορίαν (Pol.)—but also in xii. 4 a. 1; 8. 1; 11. 4; 12. 1; xvi. 14. 7-8; xxix. 12. 10-12, etc.³ Moreover, this use of Polybius can be exactly paralleled in another passage in which Diodorus borrows his strictures on Timaeus. In xxi. 17 Diodorus discusses Timaeus' treatment of Agathocles in terms which recall clearly the argument of Polybius xii. 15 and xii. 26 b. 4,⁴ without being taken directly from either passage, and he in fact includes material not actually in our text of Polybius. It seems clear that here, as in xiii. 90, Diodorus is drawing on Polybius from memory, and further that he possessed a fairly thorough knowledge of at least Book XII of Polybius.

One small point remains. The restoration of the bull to Agrigentum must, of course, have been a completely familiar episode to Diodorus. As we saw above, Polybius had certainly described it in Book XXXVIII; and in any case by the time of Augustus it must have been part of the tradition which had grown up around the younger Scipio. Plutarch will scarcely have been the first to compose a biography of the hero.⁵ Diodorus' contemporary, C. Iulius Hyginus, who wrote a life of the elder Africanus,⁶ may well have touched on the younger in his *libri de vita rebusque illustrium virorum*.⁷ Moreover,

¹ The restoration of the bull to Agrigentum was described in its proper place by Diodorus, xxxii. 25; and Schwartz, *op. cit.* cols. 689-90, has shown that here Diodorus is giving a mere excerpting from Polybius. That Polybius did in fact include such a reference forward in xii. 25, and that it was omitted by the excerptor of the collection of Valesius' extracts is highly unlikely.

² Diodorus' misunderstanding of what Timaeus said thus comes via Polybius. But Timaeus must have made his point a little obscurely to mislead Polybius into thinking that he denied the existence of the bull outright. On the other hand, Polybius was inclined to be careless in polemic. In i. 15. 1-11 he attributes to Philinus the statement that in 264 B.C. Appius Claudius was defeated at Mesana by Hiero of Syracuse and the Carthaginians in turn, but that both victors retreated and let him march on Syracuse. It is hardly credible that this was what Philinus wrote: for discussion see Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.* iv. 2, 523 f.; De Sanctis, *op. cit.* iii. 1, 109, n. 23; 232; 236-7.

³ Timaeus' *μικρία* is a constant theme in Polybius' polemic throughout Book xii.

⁴ Cf. Schwartz, *op. cit.* col. 688.

⁵ Cf. Gell. iii. 4. 1; for Plutarch's biography cf. *Plut. Ti. Gracch.* 21. 3; *C. Gracch.* 10. 4.

⁶ Gell. vi. 1. 2.

⁷ Gell. i. 14. 1; cf. Asconius in Cic. *Pison.* 13. 13 (on which see Tolkehn, P.-W., s.v. 'Iulius Hyginus (278)', cols. 632-3).

Plutarch's *Apophthegmata Scipionis Minoris* are typical of the many collections of Scipio's *bons mots*, which evidently circulated in the rhetorical schools from Cicero's time onwards.¹ Finally, as a Sicilian, Diodorus was clearly familiar with the examples of Scipio's generosity displayed in almost every city of his native province. In short, there were

¹ Cf. Val. Max. v. 1. 6 (example of Scipio's *humanitas*). Neither Valerius nor Plutarch in his *Apophthegmata* actually includes the anecdote of the restoration of the bull. But Cicero's version (above, p. 39, n. 5) rings like an example of *mansuetudo* straight from some *suasoria*—though this does not exclude the possibility that it is authentic. Few can have seen more clearly than Scipio how low the stock of Roman *mansuetudo* had sunk in 146, the year of the destruction of Carthage and Corinth; and how essential it was to use every opportunity to rebuild the Roman *πρωτοίπεος* among the Greeks.

countless channels by which he must have learned of the return of Phalaris' bull to Agrigentum in 146. Accordingly his polemic against Timaeus is to be regarded as an example of unintelligent, but independent, source-criticism, largely inspired by his recollection of what Polybius had written in various parts of Book XII.¹ The result hardly justifies any regret that in the main Diodorus restricted himself to excerpting his sources.

F. W. WALBANK.

University of Liverpool.

¹ I have already pointed out in *C.Q.* xxxix (1945), 4 the impossibility of a suggestion made by Margrit Kunz, *Zur Beurteilung der Prooemien in Diodors historischer Bibliothek* (Diss. Zürich, 1935), 13–14, that Diodorus' source for xiii. 90 is Philinus of Agrigentum; for Philinus was contemporary with the First Punic War.

QUINTILIAN XII. 2. 28 AND 31

RADERMACHER's text of § 31 runs:

Quantum enim Graeci praeceptis valent, tantum Romani, quod est maius, exemplis. † Tantum quod non cognatis side rebus admoveri** qui non modo proximum tempus lucemque praesentem intueri satis credat, sed omnem posteritatis memoriam spatium vitae honestae et curriculum laudis existimet: hinc mihi ille iustitiae haustus bibat, hinc sumptam libertatem in causis atque consiliis praestet.

cognatis side (ide Bn) rebus admoveri qui B
cognotis (cognoti b) sideribus adueri qui bH
cognatis idem rebus admoveri (v *super* n add.
P) qui NP

I append a list of earlier readings:

tantumque non cognatis sideribus admoneri
(Locatelli)
tantumque non cognatis id e rebus admoneri
(Badius Ascensius)
tantum quod non cognatis sideribus admoneri
quin (Obrecht)
tantumque non cognatis id e rebus admoneri
sciet (Rollin, Burman, Capperonnier, Gesner,
Spalding, Gernhard)
tantum quod non cognitis ille rebus sat habuerit
(Zumpt)
tantum quod non cognoscendis rebus adque-
verit (Bonnell, in his *Lexicon* to Q.)
tantumque non cognitis ille rebus adqueverit
(Bonnell, in his edn.)
tantum quod cognitis ille rebus adqueverit
(Halm, Meister, Beltrami)

Out of the welter of MS. variants and editors' hopeful suggestions, one clear fact emerges: *cognatis sideribus* is the true reading. The sound judgement of

Locatelli and Obrecht has lately been supported by Stroux (*Philologus*, xci, p. 231 f.) and Morel (*Latomus*, iii, p. 157); it may be added that Gernhard defends this reading in the notes to his edition, though he does not admit it to his text and does not seem to realize the meaning.

Morel sees in *cognatis sideribus* a quotation from Ovid, *Met.* xv. 839, 'nec nisi cum senior Pylios aequaverit annos | aetherias sedes cognataque sidera tanget', and would read *cognatis* <ut ait Ovidius> *sideribus admoveri* <videtur> qui . . . This, however, is needless, as can be seen from Seneca, *Suas.* vi. 6, 'animus vero divina origine haustus, cui nec senectus ulla nec mors, onerosi corporis vinculis exsolutus ad sedes suas et cognata sidera recurret'. The phrase *cognata sidera*, used in reference to the soul, must have been familiar to the rhetoricians, influenced as they were by Stoic thought; and the parallel puts beyond any doubt that *cognatis sideribus* is the true reading here.

Can any sense be obtained from *tantum quod non*? It is possible, I suppose, to take the words as equivalent to *δοσὸν οὐ*: there are several instances (none, however, in Q.) where *tantum quod* = 'barely', in temporal clauses, supple-

mented by a *cum* clause (e.g. Cic. *ad Fam.* vii. 23. 1 'tantum quod ex Arpinati veneram, cum mihi a te litterae redditae sunt'—see other examples in Kühner, *Lat. Gramm.* II. ii, p. 272); thus here *tantum quod non* might = 'barely not', i.e. 'very nearly', with the following relative clause as a supplement. But any such explanation is very forced, and in any case such a meaning is not really satisfactory. Radermacher seems right in suggesting that *tantum quod* is a repetition from the previous sentence.

Admoveri is surely on the right lines; for the meaning, see Ovid, *Her.* xi. 17 f. 'quid iuvat admotam per avorum nomina caelo | inter cognatos posse referre Iovem?', Sil. Ital. viii. 225 'sed genus admotum superis, summumque per altos | attingebat avos caelum.' But the infinitive has no construction; Radermacher marks a lacuna, wisely ignoring earlier stopgaps.

Thus, even with *cognatis sideribus* established as certain, there are difficulties; and these lead to a much wider question: how far is any reference to *cognata sidera* relevant here at all? In §§ 29–30 Q. urges that the orator, besides being thoroughly acquainted with abstract philosophical precepts, should study also their practical application by the grand old Romans of the past. The sudden transition to any idea of 'becoming related to kindred stars' is most startling; besides which, one would at least expect the expression to form a climax. I believe that Stroux has seen the solution to the problem, by showing that the phrase, though incongruous here, is relevant elsewhere. *Cognatus* is a word that implies a complement; and *cognata sidera* is only intelligible in a context relating to the soul, as in Seneca, l.c.: in § 31 that context is markedly absent—but close at hand there is such a context, as Stroux saw, namely, before the lacuna at the end of § 28.

Q.'s belief in the divine origin of the soul is stressed in the forefront of his book (i. 1. 1 'sicut aves ad volatum, equi ad cursum, ad saevitiam ferae gignuntur, ita nobis propria est mentis agitatio atque sollertia, unde origo animi caelestis creditur'—cf. xii. 2. 21). He

goes further in ii. 16. 12 ff. ('et hercule deus ille princeps parens rerum fabricatorque mundi nullo magis hominem separavit a ceteris, quae quidem mortalia essent, animalibus quam dicendi facultate. . . . rationem igitur nobis praecipuam dedit eiusque nos socios esse cum dis immortalibus voluit. . . . denique homines, quibus negata vox est, quantum adiuvat animus ille caelestis?'). For Q., oratory is a divine gift, the outward expression of the heavenly nature of the soul: 'kinship with the stars', in a proper context, is a natural claim for his *vir bonus dicendi peritus*.

In § 28 Q. sums up the advantages that the orator will gain from the study of philosophy in its varying aspects: 'haec sunt, quibus mens pariter atque oratio insurgant: quae vere bona, quid mitiget metus, coerceat cupiditates, eximat nos opinionibus vulgi animumque caelestem *'. The climax is missing, and no satisfactory way of filling the lacuna has been proposed (*erigat*, Meister; *levet*, Buttmann; *animumque deceat caelestem*, Spalding). But here is the very reference to the heaven-born soul that is needed to complete the picture of *cognata sidera*; and Stroux's bold proposal to conflate the two dislocations, as it were, and to read in § 28 'animumque caelestem <cognatis sideribus admovere queat>', deserves serious consideration. With this reading the sense is completed, with *cognata sidera* in a natural context, and that too in a climax such as so strong an expression makes absolutely essential. The meaning is: 'These are the themes which can give elevation to mind and speech alike: namely, what is truly good, what can allay fears, check passions, lift us out of the thoughts of the common herd, and bring our heaven-born soul close to the stars its kin.' That, says Q., is the function of oratory.¹

To return now to § 31: Stroux makes no suggestion for dealing with the gap now left. But a closer inspection shows

¹ There is a noteworthy parallel in Sen. *Epp.* 88. 3, 'quid horum ad virtutem viam sternit? syllabarum enarratio et verborum diligentia et fabularum memoria . . . ? quid ex his metum demit, cupiditatem eximit, libidinem frenat?'

that no real gap exists: we have here an intrusion, not a lacuna. *Tantum quod* may be disregarded as an attempt to connect the 'strayed words' in some way with the context, by repetition from the previous sentence; we then have left '[*tantum quod*] non [*cognatis sideribus admoveri*] qui non modo', etc.; from which it is possible to infer that *non* also is out of place. Consideration of the rest of the sentence shows where it ought to stand. Let § 31 begin 'qui non modo proximum tempus lucemque praesentem intueri (<non> satis credat', etc., and the sense is clear, with *qui . . . existimet* as protasis to *hinc . . . praestet*: 'if a man should not only hold it inadequate to keep in view recent times and the light that beats upon present events, but should regard the whole tradition of posterity as the course for his career of honour and his field for fame, it is from these precedents (*hinc*) that I would have him drain draughts of justice, from these derive his ideal of freedom and display it in the courts and in deliberative assemblies.' The true orator, with an eye to posterity also, must always base his conduct and thought on

the practical virtues of the past. *Hinc* now has a natural interpretation which accords with the context of §§ 29-30: with the accepted text, however emended, it is hard to see the connexion of the clause *hinc . . . praestet*.

The obvious lacuna at the end of § 28 puts the reader on his guard; the occurrence in § 31 of a startlingly irrelevant expression, combined with complete confusion of MSS., shows that the dislocation in this part of the chapter is more serious than might at first be suspected. It is the irrelevance of *cognatis sideribus*, in itself so plainly sound, that has caused the persistent attempts at emendation. Stroux's proposal, violent as it at first appears, achieves a triple object: the irrelevance is removed from § 31, the words *cognatis sideribus* are given their only possible context and position by being transferred to § 28, and the lacuna there is satisfactorily filled; an achievement which affords the best answer to the criticism that such a remarkable MS. accident is, to say the least, improbable.

R. G. AUSTIN.

University College, Cardiff.

HORACE, *Odes*, I. 28. 7-9

occidit et Pelopis genitor, conviva deorum,
Tithonusque remotus in auras
et Iovis arcanis Minos admissus . . .

COMMENTATORS do not seem to have been puzzled by the reference in line 8 to the death of Tithonus, although it does not fit very well into the mythological context. The poet's argument is that death has been inevitable even in the case of men who received special honour from the gods. Thus Tantalus was made the guest of the gods, Tithonus was removed to heaven, and Minos was admitted to the secrets of Jove. Yet they all died. The difficulty is that whereas legend tells of the death of Tantalus and Minos and of the work then assigned to them in the underworld, Tithonus upon his removal to heaven by Aurora is said to have been granted immortality although without the accompanying gift of eternal youth. In what sense does Horace think of his having died?

He cannot be regarding the removal of Tithonus to heaven as equivalent to his death as a mortal, for the phrase *remotus in auras* is parallel to the phrases *conviva deorum* and *Iovis arcanis . . . admissus*, used to describe the high favours which were accorded to Tantalus and Minos before their departure to the underworld.

It is tempting, at first, to think that Horace knew of the story according to which Tithonus asked Aurora that he might die, since his old age was becoming so burdensome. Aurora, according to this story, acceded to his request only to the extent of changing him into a grasshopper. A. Rapp in Roscher, *Lexikon der griechischen u. römischen Mythologie*, i. 1263, thinks that a suggestion of this legend occurs in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite, l. 237, where it is said of Tithonus' voice τοῦ δ' ἤτοι φωνῇ ρεῖ ἄσπετος οὐδέ τι κίκυς

ἐστὶν
duce
iii.
liken
and
to th
Scho
seem
and
mory
of T
have
deta
A
view
figur
long
Wha
now

SO

APPE
lang
pass
he ei
new
mans
the c
read
to su
place

Book

5.
rerun
Virg
noct
gum
acerv
umbr
cedid
14.
anxi
Ande
27.
num
plebi

¹ Cf
Gesells
1914, p
² On
tributi
klassis
758-66

ἔσθ' ; and, following Welcker, Rapp adduces the comparison made in *Iliad*, iii. 151, where babbling old men are likened to grasshoppers. But the full and explicit narration of this appendix to the legend does not appear before Schol. *ad Il.* xi. 5. It was not known, it seems, to Virgil, Ovid, or Propertius; and although such a humiliating metamorphosis might be regarded as the end of Tithonus, Horace would doubtless have referred to the story with some detail had he known it himself.

A second possibility is that the poet views Tantalus, Tithonus, and Minos as figures in ancient legends which have long been enacted and done with. Whatever their glories, these heroes are now dead. Against this view is the

detailed allusion to three separate legends, two of which involve a story of death after exaltation.

Again, it is possible that Horace regards the increasingly decrepit old age of Tithonus as a condition tantamount to death. In Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, ix. 421, and Propertius, iii. 18, reference is made to his shrivelled senility; and in his *Odes*, ii. 16. 29-30, Horace groups the aged Tithonus with the dead Achilles:

abstulit clarum cita mors Achillem,
longa Tithonum minuit senectus . . .

On this view, *occidit* as applied to Tithonus is a poetic inexactitude.

J. G. GRIFFITH.

The Queen's College, Oxford.

SOME CERTAIN OR POSSIBLE EXAMPLES OF LITERARY REMINISCENCE IN TACITUS.

APPRECIATION of Tacitus' artistry in language requires a knowledge of those passages in earlier writers from which he either borrows without change for a new setting or takes what his craftsmanship can transform without hiding the original from the recognition of his readers.¹ What follows is an attempt to supply this knowledge in some of the places where it has not yet been given.

Book I

Annals

5. 4 simul excessisse Augustum et rerum potiri Neronem fama eadem tulit. Virg. *Aen.* vi. 502-4 mihi fama suprema | nocte tulit fessum uasta te caede Pelasgum | procubuisse super confusae stragis acruum (Sil. xi. 255-6 mihi fama sub umbras | te feret oppressum Capuae cecidisse ruinis, Lucan, iii. 417-18).

14. 2 anxius inuidia. Livy ix. 46. 9 anxios inuidia, where I see Mr. W. B. Anderson quotes this passage of Tacitus.²

27. 2 ut illic quoque commodis legionum aduersaretur. Livy vi. 40. 3 semper plebis commodis aduersatos esse.

¹ Cf. R. Reitzenstein, *Nachr. von d. königl. Gesellschaft d. Wiss. zu Göttingen*, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 1914, p. 267.

² On Tacitus and Livy there is a valuable contribution by G. Andresen in *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie*, 1916, 210-14, 401-6, 688-94, 758-66.

31. 5 sua in manu sitam rem Romanam. With this phrase *in manu situm esse*, which recurs in *Hist.* ii. 27. 2, cf. Sallust, *Iug.* 31. 5. There are later examples in Apul. *De Deo Socr.* 105 and Boeth. *Cons.* iii. 5. 8.

57. 5 spolia . . . plerisque eorum qui tum in deditionem ueniebant praedae data. Livy ii. 25. 5 oppidum . . . praedae datum, vii. 16. 4 castra . . . urbemque praedae do.

61. 2 prima Vari castra lato ambitu et dimensis principiis trium legionum manus ostentabant. Sall. *Hist.* frg. ii. 64 apud quos (sc. Saguntinos) etiam tum semiruta moenia, domus intactae parietesque templorum ambusti manus Punicas ostentabant (*Germania* 37. 1).

74. 2 egens, ignotus, inquires. Possibly Tacitus remembers Virg. *Aen.* i. 384 ipse ignotus egens Libyae deserta peragro.

Book II

29. 1 Libo interim ueste mutata cum primoribus feminis circumire domos. Livy viii. 37. 9 ea multitudo ueste mutata . . . tribus circuit.

40. 1 Tiberium anceps cura distrahere. Livy xxxiv. 12. 1 consulem . . . anceps cura agitare.

52. 3 ne bellum metu eluderent. Livy ii. 48. 6 bellum quiete . . . eludentes.

56. 2 fauor nationis inclinabat in Zenonem. Livy xxiv. 8. 9 in quos prae-rogatiuae fauor inclinauit.

78. 2 ignauo ad ministeria belli. Livy iv. 27. 1 subita belli ministeria, iv. 43. 4 ad ministeria belli praesto essent, xxvi. 47. 2 ad ministeria belli enixe operam nauassent.

79. 2 eam maxime nouis consiliis idoneam rebatur. Sall. *Cat.* 39. 6 quoscumque moribus aut fortuna nouis rebus idoneos credebat.

83. 1 ingenio ualidus. Sall. *Hist.* frg. i. 116 ingenio ualidus, *Iug.* 6. 1.

Book III

15. 1 donec mediae Pisoni spes. Sil. ix. 356-7 mediaeque diu pendente per ambas | spe gentes.

31. 4 qui iuuentutis irreuerentiam grauibz decretis notaissent. Cic. *or.* frg. A. ix. 3 grauissimis uestris decretis absens notatus est.

34. 4 frustra nostram ignauiam alia ad uocabula transferri. Sall. *Orat. Macri* 13 neu nomina rerum ad ignauiam mutant otium pro seruitio appelletis.

41. 1 cohorte quae Lugduni praesidium agitabat. Livy xxvii. 15. 17 Brutiorum cohortem praesidium agitare.

42. 1 militia disciplinaque nostra habebatur. Livy xlv. 35. 6 antiqua disciplina milites habuerat, 37. 2 antiqua disciplina habiti.

48. 1 impiger militiae. Why do commentators not quote Horace's *militiae piger* here or at *Hist.* i. 87. 2?

71. 1 incessit dein religio quonam in templo locandum foret donum. Livy viii. 3. 4 religio incessit ab eis quorum imminutum imperium esset comitia haberi, 17. 4 religio deinde incessit uitio eos creatos.

Book IV

38. 5 optimos quippe mortalium altissima cupere. Sall. *Cat.* 5. 5 nimis alta semper cupiebat.

39. 1 nimia fortuna. Livy v. 21. 15, x. 13. 6, xlv. 41. 67.

40. 3 quid si intendatur certamen tali coniugio? Virg. *Aen.* iv. 47-8 quam tu urbem, soror, hanc cernes, quae surgere regna | coniugio tali.

44. 3 ossaque tumulto Octauiorum

inlata per decretum senatus. Sall. *Cat.* 51. 36 per senatus decretum consul gladium eduxerit.

46. 1 montium editis. *Ann.* xii. 56. 3, Curt. vi. 6. 25.

49. 3 egestate pabuli. Sall. *Iug.* 44. 4 pabuli egestas.

50. 2 longo usu uim atque clementiam Romanam edoctus. Livy vi. 32. 7 longa societate militiam Romanam edoctae.

60. 3 atrox Drusi ingenium . . . accendebatur inuidia. Livy iii. 11. 9 atrox ingenium accenderat eo facto.

62. 3 latior ex incerto metus. Livy ix. 24. 8 omnia ex incerto maiora.

Book V

4. 1 incerta pauet. Stat. *Theb.* iv. 408 incerta pauentibus.

8. 1 in hortos Pomponii quasi fidissimum ad subsidium perfugisset. Livy xxvii. 5. 5 populoque Romano pace ac bello fidissimum annonae subsidium.

Book VI

29. 1 abruptas uenas. *Ann.* xv. 59. 5, 63. 3, xvi. 9. 2, Stat. *Silu.* ii. 1. 3.

29. 2 culpam inuidia uelauisse. Ovid, *Her.* v. 131 culpam nomine ueles.

30. 3 firmarent . . . foedus. Virg. *Aen.* xi. 330, xii. 212.

44. 2 fama . . . percussus. Livy ix. 44. 13 percussus iam fama hostem.

Book XI

12. 2 operire futura et praesentibus frui pro solacio habebat. Sall. *Iug.* 31. 13 plerique caedem in uos fecisse pro munimento habent.

16. 1 hortatur gentile decus magno animo capessere. Livy ix. 40. 12 adhortatique eos ut partem secum capesseren decoris.

25. 5 ardesceret in nuptias incestas. Ovid, *M.* v. 41 indomitas ardescit uulgus in iras.

28. 1 dedecus quidem illatum. Ovid, *M.* vi. 608-9 per uim sibi dedecus illud | illatum.

32. 1 ceteris passim dilabentibus. Livy ix. 45. 16 dilapsis passim, ii. 24. 9 dilapsi passim alii alio.

Book XII

35. 2 pleraeque caedes oriebantur.

Virg. miser
orientu
orta.

47.
iv. 17
palma
plexu

47.
Sall. A
perio
imper
imper

55.
fraudi

Book

i. 3
frg. i.
expect

8. 3
ingent
i. 53. 1
15. 3

xi. 22
fama
milita

Book

3. 2
viii. 53
5. 3
cipis c
tans v
liberta

6. 1
Livy
munie

21.
exarse
exarse

34.
Livy

Book

13.
hostili
17.
conatu

24.
ignom
ix. 15.
minia

48.
terna

Virg. *Aen.* ii. 411 and xi. 885 oriturque miserrima caedes, Lucan vii. 571 caedes oriuntur, *Ann.* xiv. 17. 1 atrox caedes orta.

47. 1 in amplexus eius effusus. Lucan iv. 176 in amplexus effusas tendere palmas (Flor. *Verg.*, p. 183, 18 in amplexum effunditur).

47. 3 uulgius duro imperio habitum. Sall. *Iug.* 64. 5 milites . . . laxiore imperio quam antea habere, 89. 4 leui imperio . . . habebantur, 92. 2 modesto imperio habiti.

55. 2 fraude in ducem. Livy xl. 20. 4 fraudis in ducem.

Book XIII

1. 3 necessitate extrema. Sall. *Hist.* frg. i. 55. 15 extremam necessitatem . . . expectat.

8. 3 corpore ingens. Virg. *Aen.* xi. 641 ingentem corpore, *Ann.* xv. 53. 2, *Hist.* i. 53. 1.

15. 3 multa scelerum fama. Virg. *Aen.* xi. 224 multa uirum meritis sustentat fama tropaeis, *Ann.* xvi. 15. 1 multa militari fama.

Book XIV

3. 2 illi tanto facinori delectus. Lucan viii. 538 sceleri delectus.

5. 3 utque subueniretur matri principis clamitat. Livy xxxiv. 25. 9 clamitans ut . . . auctorem et ducem se libertatis sequerentur.

6. 1 ut . . . uisendi curam differret. Livy xliii. 1. 12 distulit eo tempore muniendae Aquileiae curam.

21. 4 ne modica quidem studia plebis exarsere. Livy xxxii. 22. 4 in quem adeo exarsere studia.

34. 2 legionarius frequens ordinibus. Livy xxxv. 5. 6 frequens ordinibus legio.

Book XV

13. 3 hostilia faceret. Sall. *Iug.* 107. 2 hostilia faceret.

17. 2 in incerto habeantur Parthorum conatus. Sall. *Cat.* 41. 1, *Iug.* 46. 8.

24. 1 possessionem Parthis non sine ignominia Romana tradidissent. Livy ix. 15. 1 ultorque unicus Romanae ignominiae.

48. 1 multas insignesque familias paterna nobilitate complexus. Vell. Pat.

ii. 127. 3 materno uero genere clarissimas ueteresque et insignes honoribus complexum familias.¹

54. 3 cessit fas. Sen. *Med.* 900 fas omne cedat.

Book XVI

14. 1 inquires animo. Sall. *Hist.* frg. iv. 55 inquires animi.

Histories

Book I

1. 1 magna illa ingenia cessere. Sall. *Cat.* 8. 3 prouenere ibi scriptorum magna ingenia.

1. 2 obtrectatio et liuor pronis auribus accipiuntur. Perhaps Tacitus took the expression *pronis auribus*, which he uses again² at 54. 1, from Statius, *Silv.* v. 2. 58-9, whence also Claudian may have taken it in *De Bello Gild.* i. 426. Valmaggi says 'pronis auribus, più comune promptis'. Tacitus says *promptas auris*

¹ E. Klebs, *Philol.* xlix, 1890, p. 302, cites what he regards as instances of borrowing by Tacitus from Velleius. Of the eight pairs of passages only one is striking, and they find no acceptance from Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*, p. 338, or Teuffel-Kroll-Skutsch, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, iii, p. 19. Similarly, Gudeman, on p. 351 of his edition of the *Agricola* and *Germania*, denies 'the faintest trace of any indebtedness' of Tacitus to Velleius. The passages which I cite above and at *Hist.* i. 73, iv. 81. 2, *Germ.* 14. 1 and 28. 4 at least deserve to be considered. See also on *Hist.* iii. 58. 2.

² In *Thes. Ling. Lat.* ii. 1514. 61 Mr. Sinko writes 'Tac. dial. 40 populi pronis . . . auribus uti'. This is copied from Gerber and Greef's *Lexicon Taciteum*, p. 119 b, 'D 40 populi pronis . . . auribus uti'; but there is no authority for it, and when Gerber and Greef reach the word *pronis* the passage does not appear. On p. 467 a they write under *finio* 'intrs. . . de vita 2. 83. 10 quo in loco finierat'. This is an error, for the words are 'quo in loco uitam finierat'. But again Mr. Bacherler copies into the *Thesaurus* vi. 784. 58 under *finio* 'intransitive' 'Tac. ann. 2, 83 quo in loco-ierat'. On p. 4 b Gerber and Greef write under *abnuo* '12. 46 pacem et condiciones'. This is also an error, for the words there are 'non abnuere pacem Hiberos quamquam in tempore ualidiores'. But again Mr. Diehl copies into the *Thesaurus* i. 113. 26 under *abnuo* 'Tac. ann. 12. 46 pacem et condiciones'. Housman once observed that a column and a half of the *Thesaurus*, chosen at random, will generally contain a good many errors; but nothing is more discreditable to that work than this copying from a lexicon on the part of compilers who are too lazy to verify what they find in it.

at *Ann.* ii. 39. 3. I do not know where all the other examples are.

2. 1 coortae in nos Sarmatarum ac Sueborum gentes. This expression is strongly Livian: see, for instance, ii. 17. 2, 43. 4, 56. 14, iv. 3. 2, vii. 3. 9.

2. 3 atrocius . . . saeuitum. *Livy* xlii. 8. 2 atrocius . . . saeuitum.

5. 1 scelere insuper Nymphidii Sabini . . . agitur. *Livy* xxi. 41. 8 quem nisi Saguntinum scelus agitare.

5. 2 in ipso conatu. *Livy* ix. 18. 14 and xxxii. 28. 4.

9. 3 saluberrimum ad continendam militarem fidem. *Livy* xxxix. 1. 2 natus ad continendam . . . militarem disciplinam.

19. 2 facili ciuitate ad accipienda credendaque omnia noua. *Livy* viii. 11. 10 ad credendum temere faciliores erant.

23. 1 inserendo saepius querelas. *Livy* xxxv. 17. 2 querelas . . . inserit.

26. 1 incerta noctis. *Sall. Hist. frg.* ii. 87 B. 4 incerto noctis.

30. 2 seditio aduersus duces. *Livy* xxviii. 12. 4 aduersus ducem seditio.

33. 1 cunctatione nunc et segnitia. *Livy* xxii. 27. 4 in cunctatione ac segnitie.

46. 3 ad seditiones et discordias et ad extremum bella ciuilia ruebant. *Sall. Hist. frg.* i. 12 plurimae turbae, seditiones et ad postremum bella ciuilia orta sunt.

49. 2 medium ingenium. *Livy* i. 32. 4.

49. 4 uigebat aetas. *Sall. Cat.* 20. 10 uiget aetas.

52. 2 in maius omnia accipiebantur. See iii. 7. 2 and *Livy* iv. 1. 5 and xxix. 3. 9.

54. 2 nec procul seditione aberant. *Livy* viii. 32. 13 nec procul seditione aberant.

56. 2 nutantem fortunam. For this 'expression picturesque', as Goelzer calls it, cf. *Stat. Theb.* i. 194 nutat . . . fortuna carinae.

57. 2 ingenio ualidus. *Sall. Hist. frg.* i. 116 ingenio ualidus, *Iug.* 6. 1.

68. 1 non in unum consulere. *Sall. Hist. frg.* ii. 87 D cunctisque in unum tumultuose consultantibus.

73 instigandum in arma Clodium Macrum. *Vell. Pat.* i. 12. 1 Corinthiis in arma . . . instigantibus.

76. 1 primus Othoni fiduciam addidit

ex Illyrico nuntius. *Livy* xlv. 3. 5-6 nuntius ad Ascuridem paludem occurrit. addita igitur et ipsi fiducia est.

77. 1 contra decus. *Sall. Iug.* 33. 1 and 72. 2 contra decus regium.

77. 2 Viennensium honori datum interpretabantur. *Sen. De Ben.* vi. 1^o 1 honori hoc suo datum credens.

79. 2 nihil ad pedestrem pugnam tam ignauom. *Livy* ix. 4. 8 ignauissimo ad opera ac muniendum hoste.

84. 1 quem nobis animum, quas mentes imprecentur. *Livy* ix. 14. 8 eam precari mentem hostibus ut ne uallum quidem defendant.

Book II

1. 2 inclinatis ad credendum animis. *Livy* i. 51. 7 inclinatis quidem ad credendum animis.

5. 2 praecipua concordiae fides Titus and iv. 85. 1 praecipua uictoriae fides dux hostium Valentinus. *Lucan* ii. 243 (of Cato) uirtutis iam sola fides, quoted neither by the commentators nor by Luise Robbert, *De Tacito Lucani Imitatore* (Göttingen, 1917). Cf. also *Plin. Pan.* 11. 3 una eademque certissima diuinitatis fides est bonus successor.

11. 1 motis ad imperium eius e Dalmatia Pannoniaque exercitibus. Goelzer quotes *Livy* ix. 22. 7 ad ducis casum percussa, but compare rather iv. 33. 6 ad imperium dictatoris mota cuncta acies.

14. 3 additus percussis terror. *Livy* xxx. 33. 13 addidit facile Masinissa percussis terrorem and 16 addidit percussis terrorem.

16. 3 aptum tempus insidiis . . . auxilii inops. *Livy* xxii. 41. 6 locum et tempus insidiis aptum and iii. 7. 7 inops . . . auxilii humani.

22. 2 rediere infracta partium fama. *Virg. Aen.* vii. 332-3 ne noster honos infractae cedat fama loco.

26. 2 aduerso rumore fuit. With these words and with 24. 1 a little earlier senescens exercitus sui fama cf. *Livy* xxvii. 20. 9 Fului senescere fama, Marcellus etiam aduerso rumore esse.

27. 1 id damnum Vitellianos in metum compulit. *Livy* xxv. 29. 8 mercennariorum quoque militum auxilia in eundem complere metum.

30.
bus V
xxvii.
quote
tion
36
ducum
omnia
42.
tum t
60. 4
tasse
66.
xxvii.
exarsi
72.
fauore
patern
86.
ambig
17. 6 i

Book I

4. 1
solitus
sum in
5. 1
... f
Theba
8. 2
Ovid,
bellum
13. 1
repeate
G. iv. 6
xxvi. 1
15. 2
55. 24
32. 1
uictos
trum.
nec pa
neutru
39. 1
atrox i
53. 3
manu
frg. 7 e
58. 2
tur. W
socios p
'sonst
ii. 19)
munus
nem pa

30. 1 tamquam fraude et cunctationibus Valentis proelio defuissent. Livy xxvii. 21. 2, a little after the passage quoted on 26. 2, fraude eorum et cunctatione.

36. 2 laeto milite ad mutationem ducum. Sen. *De Prou.* 5. 8 laeti ad omnia.

42. 2 corporibus . . . niti . . . in euentum totius belli certabant. Sall. *Iug.* 60. 4 niti corporibus, Sil. xi. 213-14 certasse uolenti | in decus et famam leti.

66. 2 proelium atrox arsisset. Livy xxvii. 2. 8 atrox proelium . . . repente exarsit.

72. 1 nominis fauor. Livy iv. 21. 3 fauore nominis (Justin xv. 2. 3 fauore paterni nominis).

86. 3 pro certis et olim partis noua ambigua ancipitia malebat. Sall. *Cat.* 17. 6 incerta pro certis . . . malebant.

Book III

4. 1 inclementer in Vitellium inuehi solitus. Livy iii. 48. 4 inclementer in te sum inuectus.

5. 1 ut transmittere in Italiam impune . . . foret. Sen. *Phoen.* 648-9 scepra Thebano fuit | impune nulli gerere.

8. 2 Aquileiae sisti bellum . . . iubebat. Ovid, *M.* xiv. 803-4 pace tamen sisti bellum . . . placet.

13. 1 in arto commeatum. W. Heraeus repeats his father's quotation of Virg. *G.* iv. 6 in tenui. Compare rather Livy xxvi. 17. 5 in arto res esset.

15. 2 ciuili praeda. Sallust, *Hist.* frg. i. 55. 24 praeda ciuilis.

32. 1 adloquitur magnifice uictores, uictos clementer, de Cremona in neutrum. Ovid, *T.* ii. 113-14 et neque diuitiis nec paupertate notanda | unde sit in neutrum conspiciendus eques.

39. 1 atrocem inuidiam. Livy i. 51. 9 atrox inuidia.

53. 3 non se nuntiis neque epistulis sed manu et armis . . . militare. Cato, *or.* frg. 7 epistulis bellum gerit.

58. 2 curam dilectus in consules partitur. W. Heraeus cites Virgil, *Aen.* i. 194 socios partitur in omnes and says of it 'sonst ist es sehr selten (Dict. *b. Troi.* ii. 19)'. Cf. Vell. Pat. ii. 32. 3 iudicandi munus . . . aequaliter in utrumque ordinem partitus est.

65. 1 inuidia et aemulatione fortunam fratris moraretur. Luise Robbert, *De Tacito Lucani Imitatore*, p. 77, quotes Lucan ii. 581, iv. 351, vi. 726, and vii. 88. Closer is i. 393-4 ne quo languore moretur fortunam.

ibid. aetate prior. Sall. *Iug.* 10. 7.

68. 1 nox et ignotum rus fugam Neronis absconderant. Virg. *Aen.* iv. 337-8 abscondere furto . . . fugam.

71. 1 erigunt aciem per aduersum collem. Andresen, *Wochenschrift für klass. Phil.* 1916, 760 cites Livy ix. 31. 14 in aduersum clium erigitur agmen, x. 26. 8 in collem . . . aciem erexit and xxviii. 15. 10 in aduersum collem erigere aciem. He could have added xxvii. 2. 5, 48. 12, and Sil. iii. 512-13; but a better passage to quote is Livy xxix. 33. 3 per aduersum montem erectam aciem.

76. 2 plus inuidiae quam uirium partibus addebat. Sall. *Iug.* 42. 4 plusque in relicum sibi timoris quam potentiae addidit.

78. 2 ostentare potius urbi bellum quam inferre. Livy i. 11. 5 nec ostendebant bellum prius quam intulerunt.

Book IV

3. 1 discordibus municipiorum animis. Virg. *Aen.* ix. 688 animis discordibus.

3. 3 motis ad bellum Germaniis. Livy xxiii. 32. 13 consules . . . mouebant iam sese ad bellum.

23. 1 illis hibernis obsideri premique Germanias Augustus crediderat. Livy xl. 35. 13 paucae ciuitates . . . quas uicina maxime hiberna premebant.

36. 2 effusi in luxum. W. Heraeus says of effusi 'wie sonst soluti'. Cf. Livy xxxiv. 6. 9 effundantur ad luxuriam and xxxvi. 11. 3 in eandem (sc. luxuriam) et milites effusi sunt.

45. 1 nec finem iniuriae hic stetisse. *Octavia* 514 nec finis hic cruoris aut caedis stetit.

56. 3 quosdam Neruiorum Baetasiurumque in arma traxit. Ovid, *A.* i. 4. 8 Atracis ambiguos traxit in arma uiros and *M.* xiii. 39 uitataque traxit in arma.

59. 3 adiecere qui missi erant exemplum suum. Sen. *Ad Helu.* 19. 4 exemplum tibi suum . . . narrabit.

61. 1 inclutus fama. Virg. *Aen.* ii. 82-3 incluta fama gloria (Stat. *Theb.* i.

252-3 incluta fama sceptrum and xii. 331-2 incluta fama Antigone).

69. 2 unde ius auspiciumque petetur? Sil. xiii. 154 dum daret auspicium iusque in certamina ductor.

81. 2 patrati remedii gloriam penes Caesarem. Vell. Pat. ii. 30. 6 huius patrati gloria penes M. Crassum fuit.

Book V

8. 2 mores Graecorum dare adniscus. Ovid, *Rem. Am.* 762 nec rigidos mores Teia Musa dedit.

12. 1 ipsae porticus, quis templum ambibatur, egregium propugnaculum. Livy xxviii. 6. 2 uia . . . quam a mari turris quinque tabulatorum, egregium propugnaculum, clauderat.

13. 2 more humanae cupidinis. Sall. *Hist. frg.* i. 103.

20. 1 tantumque belli superfuit. Livy x. 25. 18 quantum in Etruria belli esset, xli. 8. 5 quantum belli eae provinciae haberent.

25. 3 bellum . . . ferale. Lucan vi. 397 bellis feralibus.

Agricola

3. 1 subit quippe etiam ipsius inertiae dulcedo. Livy ii. 42. 1 dulcedo agrariae legis ipsa per se dempto auctore subibat animos.

16. 2 egregius cetera. Furneaux says this expression 'seems taken from Liv. i. 35, 6' and Mr. J. G. C. Anderson calls it 'perhaps an echo' of that passage. Why is it more likely to come from there than from Sall. *Hist. frg.* iv. 70? Neither commentator gives the answer. With the words comitate quadam curandi, six lines further on in Tacitus, cf. Livy i. 34. 11 comitate inuitandi.

27. 1 nihil uirtuti suae inuium. Ovid, *M. xiv.* 113 inuia uirtuti nulla est uia.

Germania

14. 1 sua quoque fortia facta gloriae eius assignare. Vell. Pat. ii. 38. 6 Cyprus deuicta nullius adsignanda gloriae est.

28. 4 hanc gloriam sanguinis. Vell. Pat. ii. 16. 2 domestici sanguinis gloriae.

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

PLINY ON THE SMARAGDUS

Hist. Nat. 37. 62-6: Tertia auctoritas smaragdus perhibetur. . . praeterea soli gemmarum contuitu implent oculos nec satiant. quin et ab intentione alia aspectu smaragdi recreatur acies, scalpentibusque gemmas non alia gratior oculorum refectio est. . . genera eorum duodecim: nobilissimi Scythici. . . proximam laudem habent, sicut et sedem, Bactriani. . . tertium locum Aegyptii habent. . . reliqua genera in metallis aerariis inveniuntur, quapropter principatum ex iis obtinent Cyprii.

PLINY's chapters on the *smaragdus* are so lacking in scientific detail that it is impossible to identify exactly the different minerals he includes under this word. Of the twelve varieties he mentions, the first is most probably the only one which ought to be translated by the word 'emerald'; 'quantum smaragdi a gemmis distant, tantum Scythici a ceteris smaragdis.' There are, however, two clues in the passage which, considered in the light of information given by other writers, enable us to under-

stand the wide application of the word *smaragdus*.

The nine varieties grouped together as inferior are all said to occur in copper-mines. Diodorus Siculus (2. 52) confirms this: *σμαράγδους γὰρ καὶ τὰ καλούμενα βηρύλλια κατὰ τὰς ἐν τοῖς χαλκουργείοις μεταλλείας γινόμενα*. . . Now the green mineral most commonly found in copper-mines is malachite, a hydrated carbonate found in all parts of the world from Cornwall to Chile.¹ Though its pleasant shade of green has led to its being used for ornamental purposes, the fact that it is opaque precludes identification with some at least of the nine varieties associated by Pliny with copper (37. 66): 'dos eorum est in colore liquido nec diluto, verum ex umido pingui quaque perspicitur

¹ G. F. Herbert Smith, *Gem Stones* (9th ed. 1940), p. 359.

¹ Ibi

² See

du moyse

³ Epi

and Her

imitante tralucidum maris' ('Their merit lies in their colour which is clear without being weak, but limpid and rich, resembling, wherever it is transparent, the transparency of the sea'). It is unlikely on the face of it that Pliny would have classed this copper ore with the gems he rated so highly. Malachite, however, does occur in another form. It is found in the shape of small dark green crystals, which differ from the more massive and opaque form only in structure.¹ These crystals are not common, but generally occur in small quantities where there are large deposits of copper, and one can hardly blame Pliny for not recognizing that they are of the same chemical composition $[\text{Cu}_2(\text{OH})_2\text{CO}_3]$ as common malachite. Perhaps we should identify the *pseudo-smaragdus* of Pliny (37. 74-5) and Theophrastus with the coarser form.

The second piece of evidence is the claim that the *smaragdus* is good for the eyes. In this Pliny was anticipated by Theophrastus (*De Lapidibus*, iv. 24): καὶ πρὸς τὰ ὄμματα ἀγαθὴ διὸ καὶ σφραγίδια φοροῦσιν ἐξ αὐτῆς ὥστε βλέπειν.

Julius Solinus (15) follows him thus: 'nihil his iucundius, nihil utilius vident oculi. . . . nam visus, quos alterius gemmae fulgor retuderit, smaragdi recreant et exacuunt. . . . alii minus nobiles in commissuris saxorum, vel in metallis aerariis apparent, quos chalcosmaragdus nuncupant.' Confirmation is also given to the belief by the writers of medical lapidaries, e.g. the Pseudo-Dioscorides says:² Λίθος σμάραγδος ὀπτηθεῖσα καὶ λεῖα μέλιτι ἀπτικῶ μινεῖσα ἀμβλωπίας ἰᾶται. This belief was shared by most subsequent writers on precious stones, e.g. an Armenian fragment of St. Epiphanius says of the 'zmrukht' (smaragd),³ 'They relate a fable that it gives second sight'; and even as late as the seventeenth century Peter of

Arles wrote: 'Color smaragdi est viridis, qui aggregandi et non disgregandi visionem vim possidet.'

But while this property was attributed by later writers to the genuine emerald, or its 'cousin' the beryl, it is scarcely possible that the popular belief could have arisen with regard to the emerald in the time of Theophrastus, when the stone was hardly known in Greece. Was the belief, then, attached to any green stone, merely on the ground that green is in fact a restful colour to look upon? The earliest evidence for the association of a particular green mineral with the eyes comes from prehistoric Egypt. Among the scanty remains of this period there are slate palettes which still bear traces of ground malachite, evidence for the common practice of painting the eyes green. In his chapter on the Early Amratian Age in *The Making of Egypt* the late Sir Flinders Petrie writes: 'The Bedarian use of malachite as an eye-paint was continued. It is an excellent germicide, and Africans still use it on ulcers. Spread around the eyes it is the best protection against flies.'

It would seem, then, that from predynastic Egypt the knowledge was spread that the green mineral found in copper deposits was good for the eyes. The name by which this mineral was known was inevitably applied to different minerals; for the means of differentiating stones that resemble each other in colour were wanting. Thus the beneficial properties of malachite would be attributed to all the stones that were called by the same name. By Pliny's time the name *smaragdus* had been restricted to the finer varieties, and when the emerald, the finest of all green stones, became widely known, the name and properties of the common malachite were confined to it alone.

J. W. MEADOWS.

St. Bernardine's College, Buckingham.

¹ Ibid., p. 358.

² See F. de Mély, *Les lapidaires de l'antiquité et du moyen âge* (Paris, 1898), tome ii, p. 183.

³ Epiphanius, *de Gemmis*, ed. Robert P. Blake and Henri de Vis (London, 1934), p. 199.

¹ *Sympathia Septem Metallorum ac Septem Selectorum Lapidum ad Planetas* (Paris, 1610), p. 428.

BAD BRONZE AGAIN

I. PROFESSOR GEORGE THOMSON (*C.R.* lviii (1944), 35-7), in reference to a paper by Professor Fraenkel, very pertinently asks 'In what sense is the sinner, blackened and bruised and brought to sentence, comparable with bad bronze?' (Aesch. *Agam.* 390-3). He complains with some reason that Fraenkel raised the problem only to throw it aside. But Thomson himself, by explaining *μελαμπαγής* as 'blackened with congealed blood' (because of the assaults of his enemies), throws away *κακοῦ*, which is the essence of the comparison on any showing. Even the best bronze can become blood-stained, and the idea that the badness of the bronze lies in the fact that it makes poor weapons hardly brings it into any connexion with the simile even on Thomson's view of it.

He asks, too, 'If the idea of the touchstone is to be excluded, what is the point of the simile?' It is this. Just as the true quality of bronze is shown up by rubbing and hammering (*τρίβω τε καὶ προσβολαῖς*), that is, by the ordinary processes of the smith and not by any touchstone methods only applicable to gold, so is the true nature of a man revealed when he is brought to justice. If bronze or copper or brass is bad, polishing and hammering will reveal impure streaks of black; it is *μελαμπαγής*.

That it is easier to discern the badness of metals than the badness of man is a common sentiment in Greek poetry which there is no need to illustrate at length. Gold is the most obvious example, but silver and bronze serve the simile too. So far, then, as the comparison to *bronze* is concerned, I am not conscious of any special difficulty. But how do the words *μελαμπαγής* πέλει δικαιοῦς fit the *man*, to whom they grammatically belong? Has the word *μελαμπαγής*, which so aptly describes base metal, any special fitness as applied to the base man? I confess I can see none. But, after all, need there be any? The highly figurative language of Aeschylean lyric neither demands nor even allows an exact and detailed correspondence between the two parts of a simile. Here the two parts are fused into one, and if *μελαμπαγής* is more appropriate to the bronze, *δικαιοῦς* is more appropriate to the man. Professor Thomson himself cites a good example of the same kind of fusion, the eagles and the kings in 104-5.

T. A. SINCLAIR.

Queen's University of Belfast.

II. In *C.R.* lviii (1944), 36 Professor George Thomson states that 'Gold was assayed in ancient times by rubbing it on the so-called *Λυδία λίθος* which, if the metal was impure, left a black streak (Bacch. fr. 10, Theog. 449-51).' The assumption that the touchstone left a black streak on impure gold vitiates his interpretation of *Agam.* 390-3, for it is not supported by any literary evidence and is contrary to the facts, which are correctly stated by Theophr. *De Lap.* 45 οὐ γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον δοκιμάζει (sc. ὁ λίθος), ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν πῦρ τῷ τὰ χρώματα μεταβάλλειν καὶ ἀξιοῦν (? ἰσὺν), ὁ δὲ λίθος τῇ παρατρίψει· δύνανται γὰρ ὡς εἰκεν ἐκλαμβάνειν τὴν ἐκάστου φύσιν.

It is clear from this passage that there were two methods of testing gold, by fire and by the touchstone, and that they were entirely different in their effects. Impure gold was discoloured only when it was tested by fire. The touchstone, whether applied to pure or to impure gold, did no more than remove from the surface a thin film of metal (*ἐκλαμβάνειν τὴν ἐκάστου φύσιν*), which appeared on the stone as a streak (*σημεῖα*, *De Lap.* 46). The metal and the streak left by it would be identical in colour, the test being completed by a comparison of this streak with one made by gold of the greatest possible purity. Hence the terms *παρατρίψις* (*De Lap.* 45) and *παρατρίβειν* (*Hdt.* vii. 10, Theog. 417-18): the metal under test was rubbed alongside the streak which served as the standard of purity.

The misconception may have arisen from Theognis 449-51

εὐρήσεις δέ με πᾶσιν ἐπ' ἔργμασιν ὥσπερ ἀπέφθον
χρυσόν, ἐρυθρὸν ἰδεῖν τριβόμενον βασάνῳ,
τοῦ χροῖης καθύπερθε μέλας οὐχ ἄπτεται ἰός,

where τοῦ χροῖης . . . ἰός might at first sight suggest that a black mark is left by the touchstone. But the following line (452)

οὐδ' εὐρώς, αἰεὶ δ' ἄνθος ἔχει καθαρὸν

is against such an interpretation. The touchstone could hardly leave both ἰός and εὐρώς on the metal, while αἰεὶ shows that Theognis is describing not a momentary reaction but an enduring characteristic. 'When put to the test, I shall be found to be like pure gold, which is never discoloured, but always keeps its bloom.'

Thus the question whether there is in fact any reference to the touchstone in *Agam.* 390-3 is still open to debate. It is clear that no comparison between bad bronze blackened by the blows of war and bad gold blackened by the friction of the touchstone is possible, for it was not the touchstone which marked the gold, but on the contrary the gold which marked the touchstone.¹

D. E. EICHHOLZ.

University of Bristol.

¹ I am indebted to Dr. Stanley Smith, of the University of Bristol, for mineralogical details.

THE WHEEL AND THE CROWN

PROFESSOR THOMSON'S kindly invitation to me to reconsider my view of the lines κύκλου δ' ἐξέπταν βαρυνεὺς ἀργαλέου, | ἱμερτοῦ δ' ἐπέβαν στεφάνου ποσὶ καρταλίμοισι is one to which I gladly respond, especially as on one point he convinces me. I now agree that the 'wheel'—the cycle of recurrent births and deaths—is a metaphor from the wheel of torture. The passage of Simplicius which he quotes (and which I ought to have discovered or remembered) leaves no doubt of this. The victim was bound to the spokes of this and so was inside the circular rim (ἐνδεθῆναι), and when he escaped he got outside this circle (ἐξέπταν). I agree that it would be equally possible to say that he got off the wheel; but the word for this would not be ἐξέπταν. ἐξ- implies that he was previously ἐν- inside some enclosure—not, e.g., merely ἐπὶ. The

second line is much more difficult. The question at issue is whether *ἐπέβαν στέφανον* can mean 'attained a crown', and the difficulty of this is that *ἐπέβαν* in its non-physical sense of 'attain to' seems only to be used with abstract words (mainly states of being or qualities)—the metaphor being 'to tread the path of', etc., whereas *στέφανος*, if the meaning is 'a crown', is definitely concrete and the phrase could only mean that the Orphic trod on it. Consequently I still prefer to regard *στέφανος* as the circle of the blessed within which the Orphic now trod, the use of *στέφανος* being closely parallel to that of *καλλιπαῖδα στέφανον* in Eur. *H.F.* 839 (= *καλῶν παιδῶν στέφανον*). Professor Thomson's interpretation of the line as a metaphor from the Games is very attractive, but I cannot get over the difficulty of his treatment of *ἐπέβαν στέφανον*, and towards the end of his article he suggests that the *στέφανος* was the crown which was placed on the head of the mystic at the *ἐποπτεία*; if so, it was not the athlete's crown.

His subsidiary arguments are not conclusive; *ποῖο καρπαλίμοισι* need not refer to games; *ἡμεροῦ στέφανον* need not bear the same sense as the *ἡμεροῖ στέφανοι* set on the head of Pandora in Hesiod, since *ἡμερόσ* is freely used both of persons and things and could quite well be applied to *στέφανος* in more than one of the senses of that word; and even if *ἐμβατεύειν* is a *vox propria* of the mysteries, it does not necessarily follow that any synonym of *ἐμβατεύειν* could be so used. But we may at least thank Professor Thomson for an interesting collection of passages.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

[THEOCRITUS] *ID.* XXIII. 53 f.

ὁ δ' αὖτ' ὤξε θύρας καὶ τὸν νεκρὸν εἶδεν
αὐλᾶς ἐξ ἰδίας ἀρταμένον οὐδ' ἐλυγίχθη
τὰν ψυχάν.

THE two MSS. responsible for the survival of this disgusting poem present it in a form no less repellent than itself. They write (to say nothing of *ἡρτημένον*) αὐτοῖξε and ἐτυλίχθη in these lines, and their depravations elsewhere frequently make plausible emendation impossible. Here, however, one more change will, I think, restore the author's words.

The slighted lover, after concluding his maundings, hangs himself by a method of which the MSS. obscure the details, and the boy brushes contemptuously past his corpse as he leaves the house. You cannot hang yourself ἐξ αὐλᾶς, and it is plain both from the boy's encounter with the corpse and from the suicide's intention to be found ἀρταμένον ἐν προθύροις (36) that he hangs himself in the doorway. Meineke, therefore, plausibly proposed φιλᾶς ἐξ ἰδίας. It will be simpler to write αὐλίας ἰδίας. For ἀρτῶν with a simple genitive of the point of attachment see, e.g., Ael. *N.A.* 4. 51, App. *B.C.* 4. 55, Herodian 4. 14. 6; an explanatory preposition, which scholia are apt to supply with *κρεμάννυμι* so used (e.g. Eur. *Andr.* 1121, Ar. *Plut.* 312), would readily find its way into the text. Αὐλία (sc. θύρα) is, of course, common for the main door of the house (e.g. Theoc. 15. 43).

A. S. F. GOW.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

MARCUS ANTONINUS VI. 13

δεῖ . . . ὅπου λῶν ἐξίσπιστα τὰ πράγματα φαντάζεται, ἀπογυμνοῦν αὐτὰ καὶ τὴν εὐτέλειαν αὐτῶν καθορᾶν καὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν ἔφ' ἣ σμενύεται περιαιρεῖν.

Rendall truly observed in 1894 that 'no one produces any justification for translating *ἱστορίαν* "consideration", in the sense of "importance, dignity, pretentiousness", nor is there the least trace of such implication in Marcus' uses of the word' (*J. Phil.* xxiii. 142). It is accordingly obelized in the Teubner, Loeb, and Budé editions. Farquharson defends it, translating 'profession', but cites no genuine parallel: at Plut. *de aud.* 48 D. which he quotes, *ἱστορικὴν* (ἐξίω) means merely the habit of mind which is content to amass facts, in contrast with philosophical reflection.

The conjectures known to me are *τερβρεῖαν* (Reiske), *τορεῖαν* or *ὑψηγορεῖαν* (Rendall), *ῥητορεῖαν* (Herbert Richards), *εὐστοχίαν* (Schenkl), *εὐοσίαν* (Trannoy). All these seem wide of the *ductus litterarum* or wide of the sense required; some of them are wide of both. The Emperor's meaning is clear from the examples he has just given: we are to remind ourselves that the succulent joint of pork is the corpse of a pig, that the purple robe is a sheep's fleece stained with a shell-fish's blood, etc.; we are in fact to resist the sensuous appeal of luxury by reducing it mentally to its raw materials.

I think the required word is *ἱστουργίαν*: we must discount 'the work of the loom'—literally in the case of the robe, metaphorically in the other cases. If the γ fell out or were overlooked, the word would naturally be read as *ἱστορίαν*. The Emperor took it, as he did much of his vocabulary, from Plato (*Symp.* 197 B). For its metaphorical application compare the *ἱστός* of *Phaedo* 84 A on which the soul weaves the web of sensual desire: this famous passage may well have suggested the choice of *ἱστουργίαν* here.

E. R. DODDS.

Christ Church, Oxford.

TWO NOTES ON PLOTINUS

Enn. II. iii. 3. *εἰς δὲ τις αὐτῶν καὶ ἀποκλίνει ἀμείνων*. Plotinus is here exposing the futility of astrology. It is absurd to suppose that the planets change their character according to their positions and aspects, so that 'one is joyous at its rising but sad at its setting, another angry at its rising but mild at its setting, *εἰς δὲ τις . . . ἀμείνων*'. Evidently there is something wrong with this last clause. I suggest reading καὶ (ἀνατεilas καὶ) | ἀποκλίνει ἀπήμων, 'harmless both at its rise and at its setting'.

Enn. II. ix. 17. *εἰ δὲ τις φήσει ἑωρακένας καλοὺς ὄντας ὄντας, αἰσχροὺς δὲ πάντων, οἶμαι μὲν αὐτὸν μὴ ἑωρακένας, ἀλλ' ἄλλους εἶναι νομίζειν τοὺς καλοὺς*. True beauty is incompatible with ugliness in 'the inner man': those who think otherwise are mistaken. That is the sense intended, but not what the clause ἀλλ' ἄλλους . . . καλοὺς expresses. We should rewrite it thus: ἀλλ' ἄλλως ('wrongly') εἶναι νομίζειν (τού)τους καλοὺς.

R. G. BURY.

Cambridge.

REVIEWS

PAIDEIA II

Werner JAEGER: *Paideia*. The Ideals of Greek Culture. Translated from the German manuscript by Gilbert Highet. Volume II. *In Search of the Divine Centre*. Pp. xv+442. Oxford: Blackwell, 1944. Cloth, 22s. 6d. net.

JAEGER has abandoned his original plan: *Paideia* is now to stop short of Aristotle and exclude the Hellenistic, Graeco-Roman, and Christian periods. This volume deals with Socrates, Plato's Socratic dialogues, and *Prot.*, *Gorg.*, *Meno*, *Symp.*, and *Rep.*

As applied to Plato, Jaeger's 'biological view' has its attractions. If Plato's philosophy grew 'organically', 'like a tree' (cf. p. 96), and not in a straight line, it becomes possible to stress the connexions of thought which really exist between the dialogues without the risk of wrongly presenting Plato as a mechanical system-maker. But J. rather spoils this point of view by arguing that the dialogues show a development not of thought but of exposition. It is doubtless right to insist on 'the numerous connecting lines', and on the fact that Plato did not put into each dialogue 'everything he can possibly say' (105, 97). But these are inadequate grounds for asserting 'a close organic connexion' between the earlier dialogues and *Rep.*, in which they converge 'by mathematical certainty', or for claiming that when Plato 'wrote the first words of his first Socratic dialogue, he knew the whole of which it was to be a part' (96). An obvious crux is *Prot.* which, according to J., is the first to exhibit virtue as one and indivisible. J. holds that Socrates does not commit himself to the hedonistic position in *Prot.* But the proof that courage is knowledge, and that virtue is consequently one, rests on the hedonistic assumption and must disappear along with it. Hence *Prot.* is not really a 'summit' (123) from which we can comfortably survey the paths by which we have climbed. The general argument, however, is that *Rep.* is the 'entelechy'

of the earlier discussions of virtue, all (he should rather say 'some') of which assume the Good as the 'fixed point of reference' (175), and knowledge of the Good as the factor which 'determines' (122; at 396, n. 54 he says 'enables'—and so also elsewhere—but that is a very different doctrine) the will to act virtuously. On the other hand, J. is sometimes open to the criticism of ignoring connexions which do not suit his views. The argument for immortality in *Rep.* x is not unconnected with *Phaedo*. But J. says that Plato 'does not even consider that the life of the soul might depend on the life of the body' (366). He considered it in *Phaedo*; and why should he put into *Rep.* 'everything he can possibly say'?

But there are wider contexts in which J.'s 'organic unity' is much less well marked than in Plato's dialogues. According to Plato, neither Athens nor any other Greek city was a single city with a single will; each was 'many cities' (*Rep.* 422 e, 557 d). But J. projects on Hellenic civilization something very like the German Romantic conception of the people or the State. The unity of individual and State was, he says, typical of Greek culture for centuries, and, in Hegelian style (72), State-law was taken as the source of all the standards of human life (157). Even the philosophy of Plato was, in pseudo-mystical language, an 'effort of Athenian democracy's educational will' (239), and takes its place in history as 'a re-integration of the preceding stages of Hellenic culture' (x) without marring its 'continuity and organic unity' by that exceptional originality and fertility of mind which J.'s thesis does not seem very well able to acknowledge. Such language is all the stranger because J. at the same time explains that even before Plato there was a 'cleavage' between philosophy and Athenian democracy. He argues, indeed, that when philosophy turned to ethics, and Socrates taught new standards of conduct which differed

from those of the State, the divorce between 'spirit' and 'society' was bound to lead to a deadly conflict: Socrates' execution was 'not an accident but a profound historical necessity' (72, 155). Plato, in *Ep.* vii (accepted as genuine by J.), says it happened *κατά τινα τύχην*, and elsewhere (269) J. himself implies another explanation—that Socrates fell victim to popular prejudice not against his ethical teachings but against the corrupting influence of the sophists, with whom he was mistakenly associated in the minds of persons like Anytus (391, etc.).

Thus the problem of the relation of the individual to the State, from which alone 'the life of every individual takes its meaning' (236), became the starting-point of Plato's thought. It was the aim of the early dialogues, and, indeed, of 'all Plato's search for exact knowledge', to build up 'a political science whose task is to construct the best state' (99, 130). Such expressions suggest that Plato intended to restore the 'organic unity' of man and society. But J. abruptly reverses this interpretation. 'After Plato an unbridgeable gulf divided the Greek soul'; and ethics and politics went their separate ways. For, according to J., the theme of *Rep.* is not 'the science of the state' after all, but education and nothing but education. The community of property, husbands, wives, children, the 'racial' (247, 251, what does it mean?) qualifications of the candidate-guardians (which include a handsome appearance), the special scheme of breeding (is infanticide an educational device?), the 'very concrete thinking on economic problems' (331), all seem to indicate an interest in political structure as well as in education. In one passage, indeed (243), J. suggests that the communism is due to Plato's concern for 'the absolute unity of the social group'. But elsewhere he decidedly will not have it so. He even says that wrong education is to blame for the degeneration of the ideal State (323-4), although in the next paragraph he has to explain that according to *Rep.* 546 it is due to an unforeseeable mischance; and he argues curiously (258-9)

that because Plato *compares* his ideal State to a picture of an ideal man (*Rep.* 472 d, e), he means to depict not a State but a man, to whom the State is but an 'empty frame' (323, etc.).

The interpretations which run just as wide of the text as this are surprisingly numerous. To avoid *συμκρολογία* I shall give only a few examples and briefly. At *Rep.* 368 d, e the State is not the 'more distant' picture (207). At *Rep.* 601 b there is nothing about 'the profound idea' that poetry belongs properly to the youthful epoch in the life of the 'nation' (362). On *Ep.* vii. 325 a, b it is wrong to say that Plato received 'a second invitation' to take part in politics after the fall of the Thirty (97). In view of *Rep.* 401 c on the educational value of *καλὰ πρὸς ὄψιν* it cannot be true that 'no Greek ever thought of giving a place in *paideia* to 'the enjoyment of visual art' (228). J. thinks dialectic is to be studied from the age of twenty; he does not mention that according to *Rep.* 537 d even the pupils aged over thirty are to be introduced to it only with great caution (315). Plato's rule that children should look on at battles from a safe distance is thought to come from Tyrtaeus, who 'thinks the ability to stand and watch a battle is the highest proof of courage' (254)—a rather staggering comment on T.'s well-known eulogy of courage in face of the enemy.

No less numerous are the obscurities in J.'s argument, some of which I have already indicated. The question of Socrates' attitude towards physical speculations receives three different answers (30, 31, 75). Socrates accepted no 'dogmas', but he had a 'creed'; and if its articles as here enumerated are not 'dogmas', what are they (76, 122)? In the ideal State 'the rights of the individual are curtailed, they are not supplanted' (237); but (248) the guardians surrender 'the last relic of individuality'. Plato's concept of education is 'absolutely free from intellectualism' (295); but in what follows there is constant emphasis on the purely 'intellectual basis' (316) of the education which produces 'the aristocracy of intellect'

(319), and the 'strict subordination of everything else to the *intellectual* purpose of developing the man in man' (cf. 353). This last phrase illustrates various attempts to read a vaguely pantheistic humanism into Plato. J. accepts (rightly, I believe) the arguments of Stumpf for the identity of the Idea of Good with God. But the Good is the Beautiful of *Symp.* (194) which is identified with the 'higher self' (195). Hence, though 'God is the measure of all things' (286) J. finds no difficulty in saying also that Plato's 'standard is man' (355). He even suggests that Homer's ideal of 'godlike' is replaced by the 'manlike' of *Rep.* 501 b (277). Later he admits that this passage offers not a contrast but a parallel (287); the truly manlike for Plato is also godlike. Perhaps it is because J. identifies God with the depths of the ego that he finds it unnecessary to annotate *Rep.* 597 b on God as maker of the Idea of Bed (361) or the Idea of Injustice (418). At any rate there seems insufficient recognition of the fact that Plato's 'humanism' is of the theistic or integral variety. Obscurity also attaches to the acceptance of Stenzel's view (that Plato discovered

the Idea before he discovered the concept) combined with an acceptance of the evidence of Xenophon and Aristotle on Socrates' logical activities. But it is satisfactory to note that the baseless suggestion (i. 322) that Plato once held the views of Calicles, has been considerably mitigated (138).

I am aware that my discovery of so many difficulties in Jaeger's work may reflect on my own intelligence rather than on his methods of exposition; and I do not forget the high value placed by Plato and Aristotle on the power of 'seeing similarity', which J. possesses in a high degree. But I cannot think it right to see organic unity everywhere, even in a work apparently inspired by that principle; and in sum I submit that J. has not succeeded in surmounting the obstacle which Plato presents to this attempt of the historic 'imagination' (xiii) to view philosophy as 'only the translation' of an historically developed 'culture' into 'abstract and ideal form' (i. 105), or, more briefly, to reduce philosophy to history.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

PYTHAGOREAN POLITICS

Edwin J. MINAR, Jr.: *Early Pythagorean Politics in Practice and Theory*. Pp. x+143. Baltimore: Waverly Press Inc., 1942. Paper.

THIS book covers much the same ground as von Fritz's *Pythagorean Politics in Southern Italy* (reviewed in *C.R.* lvi. 2), and though the author does not always assent to von Fritz's conclusions he agrees with him in many points, particularly in distinguishing two anti-Pythagorean movements, that of Cylon at Croton, which he places in 510-509, and the general disturbances which led to the burning of the Pythagorean meeting-houses and the concentration of the surviving Pythagoreans in Rhegium c. 450. Mr. Minar has digested all the literature of his subject, and his reconstruction of the organization and history of the Pythagoreans in Italy is plausibly argued and very fully docu-

mented. He admits that there is little evidence for political activity by Pythagoras in Samos, but he makes the most of Aristoxenus' statement that his departure was due to the rule of Polycrates to show that Pythagoras was an anti-democrat (a conclusion which is very obscurely supported by a discussion of the Zalmoxis story), and he contends that in the Italian cities the Pythagorean societies gradually identified themselves with the ruling land-owning oligarchies. There is a long comparison with the terminology of political clubs in Old Greece, as worked out by Calhoun in *Athenian Clubs in Politics and Litigation*, but many of the words employed, such as *ἐταῖρος* and *φίλος*, are, as Mr. Minar himself admits, of so general a content that to restrict their application to a political sense when they are used of Pythagoras' followers is perhaps

some
right
he p
the
garc
not
A
of a
struc
by a
Pyth
the
relies
Tima
Porp
some
tails,
is in
can a
discu
lines
man
In
and
the p
Here
xenu
the s
tas' 7

Plato
2°
tra
tion
'Le
40
THAT
which
the ca
from
incon
All th
that i
has b
Plato
this v
this co
for it,
worke
though
it from
The
scale,

somewhat fanciful. Mr. Minar seems right, however, in the thesis, in which he parts company with von Fritz, that the Pythagoreans engaged on the oligarchical side in politics as a society and not as individuals.

A historical sketch of the expansion of a Crotonian 'empire' after the destruction of Sybaris in 510 is followed by an account of the opposition to Pythagorean oligarchical government in the fifth century, for which Mr. Minar relies on Aristoxenus, Dicaearchus, and Timaeus as reported by Iamblichus and Porphyry. Though such evidence is sometimes pressed too hard in its details, and the resulting thread of history is in places rather fine-spun, Mr. Minar can at least be said to have shirked the discussion of no difficulty, and the main lines of his account will probably command general agreement.

In his last chapter, entitled 'Politics and Philosophy', Mr. Minar deals with the political theory of the Pythagoreans. Here again he relies chiefly upon Aristoxenus, supplemented by such works as the sermons of Pythagoras and Archytas' *περὶ νόμῳ καὶ δικαιοσύνας*, which he

believes to contain authentic tradition in spite of the doubts which have been cast on them. The key to the Pythagorean political theory is *ἁρμονία*, the preservation of their due place in the structure of the state by rulers and ruled (identified with the *μαθηματικοί* and *ἀκουσματικοί* respectively), and a horror of disorder which results in conservatism. This is brought into connexion with the discovery of numerical proportion as the cause of the harmony both of macrocosm and microcosm, and with the ordering of the unlimited by the limit. Mr. Minar does not make it quite clear whether he believes that this political theory was designed to buttress Pythagorean rule or that political activity was the practical expression of the *ἁρμονία* theory, but he seems to incline to the former view. In any case the system which he puts together from his admittedly late sources is very similar to the Platonic, and in many minds this will raise what he regards as an unfair suspicion of its genuinely early Pythagorean character.

W. HAMILTON.

Eton College, Windsor.

THE PHILEBUS

Platon: Œuvres complètes. Tome IX, 2^e Partie: *Philebe*. Texte établi et traduit par Auguste Diès. (Collection Budé.) Pp. cxiii+94. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1941. Paper, 40 fr.

THAT the *Philebus* is a difficult dialogue, which does not yield up its meaning to the casual reader, and seems to wander from topic to topic with disconcerting inconsequence, is commonly recognized. All the more fortunate, therefore, is it that its interpretation in the Budé series has been entrusted to so discerning a Platonist as M. Diès. The title-page of this volume bears the date 1941; we in this country have had to wait four years for it, and we may believe that M. Diès worked under considerable difficulties, though we could hardly have guessed it from the work itself.

The Introduction is on the grand scale, running into more than a hundred

pages, in which the general scheme and purpose of the dialogue are elucidated, the occasion of its composition discussed, and all the main problems which it raises examined with the thoroughness and soundness of judgement that we have long learnt to expect from the author of *Autour de Platon*. That Galen had some cause to devote a special work to the 'transitions in the *Philebus*' is admitted: and the explanation offered is that Plato, convinced that the proper method of philosophizing is the 'art de penser à deux', deliberately refrains from writing a 'treatise', uses every means to preserve the free procedure of a conversation, and 'rather than emphasize the logical continuity of his theme, contrives ostensibly to break it'. This may well be true, though on occasion, as in the *Timaeus*, which must be close in date to the *Philebus*, he has no scruple in turning five-sixths of the

dialogue into monologue. In any case, D. has succeeded in making the reader feel that logical continuity is really there.

It is obviously impossible to summarize this Introduction, and to single out special points for commendation or criticism entails the risk of obscuring its general purport. I shall confine myself to two points of special interest. First, the notorious difficulty of finding a place for the Ideas in the fourfold classification of *πάντα τὰ νῦν ὄντα ἐν τῷ παντί*. D. suggests that 'if none of the four kinds has been able to provide a sure place for the Ideas, it is because they have been looked for exclusively in this one or that'. In a word, the four classes are themselves Ideas. This solution is ingeniously simple, but seems to the present reviewer rather to by-pass the problem than to solve it. We may admit—though this is more difficult in respect of the *αἰτία τῆς μείξεως* than of the other three—that each of the four kinds is an *εἶδος* of a very wide sort, comparable to the *μέγιστα γένη* of the *Sophist* (which, as Cornford has insisted, are not the 'greatest kinds', but some of them); yet must we not still ask where we are to find the less general Ideas—*εἶδη* other than the logically *μέγιστα*—such as Man, Ox, Beauty, and Goodness (all mentioned at 15 A), Justice, Temperance, Equality, Triangularity, and so forth?

Secondly, there is the problem of identifying the 'enemies of Philebus' (the *δυσχερεῖς* of 44 B ff.), the *κομφοί* of 53 c with their doctrine of pleasure as *γένεσις*, and 'Philebus' himself. Dissociating himself from the 'astonishing positiveness' of certain writers on these points, D. refuses—rightly, as I think—to find in Philebus a mask for anyone in particular. Citing the words *τὸν Φιλῆβου λόγον οὐ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλων πολλὰκις μυρίων* (66 E) he asks 'does not Plato seem to have wished to discard in advance all these particular identifications, and give his readers to understand that he is discussing a very generally held thesis?' In particular, he rejects the notion that Philebus stands for Eudoxus: a sound conclusion,

which he might have strengthened by pointing to the identity of *meaning* attributed by Philebus to 'good' and 'pleasant' at 60 A, and contrasting this with the recognition by Eudoxus of goods other than pleasure, as reported by Aristotle, *E.N.* 1172^b24. As to the *δυσχερεῖς*, D. remarks that what Plato gives us is 'exegesis, not report of a doctrine' (*οἶμαι γὰρ τοιόνδε τι λέγειν αὐτοῦς*, 44 D), and seems successfully to dispose of the identification with Speusippus, though it is not quite clear to me how far he is disposed to see the figure of Xenocrates here. Finally as to the *κομφοί*, D. rightly rejects Mauersberger's idea that the Megarians are meant (even if the *εἰδῶν φίλοι* of the *Sophist* are Megarians, as probably few nowadays suppose); he is inclined to look to Aristippus, but his carefully guarded language does not involve an absolute identification. All this part of the Introduction is marked by a sure-sighted and temperate judgement, which refuses to go beyond the evidence.

The translation is almost always faithful, and its style attractive, though here and there a point is missed by the use of different French words where the original has the same or cognate words: e.g. for the *δυσχερεῖς* with their *δυσχέρεια* and *δυσχεράσματα* we find 'répugnance', 'humeur chagrine', 'gens difficiles', 'les dégoûtés'; and at 24 B 'la réalisation d'une fin, c'est leur mort' weakens the force of *γενομένης γὰρ τελευτῆς καὶ αὐτῷ τετελεστηκατον*. I must, however, mention one point, involving two passages, where it seems impossible to accept D.'s version. At 66 A—a well-known crux—he adheres to the reading of the second hand in W *περὶ μέτρον μὲν πῃ . . . χρὴ νομίζειν τινὰ ἥδιον ἡρῆσθαι*, and implies in his translation, as he states explicitly in the Introduction (p. 89), that *ἡρῆσθαι περὶ μέτρον* means 'choisir la mesure'. This he defends by quoting *Soph.* 251 c *ὑπὸ πενίας τῆς περὶ φρόνησιν κτήσεως*, *Rep.* 525 A *ἢ περὶ τὸ ἐν μάθησις*, *Phil.* 20 D *πάν τὸ γιγνώσκον αὐτὸ θηρέει καὶ ἐφίεται βουλόμενον εἶλιν καὶ περὶ αὐτὸ κτήσασθαι*, where most editors read *περὶ αὐτό*. But it is surely inadmissible to infer that,

beca
nexio
equiv
conf
lent
Other
trans
ρότη
σοῦ
in m
I thi

Étude
des
Do
nun
Pp
Br
Un

THE
Ploti
reade
Ploti
sion
soph
that,
legiti
dation
Creuz
mann
Porph
ebulli
to hi
migh
Henr
includ
tion
perdu
Eusto
comp
new
excer
mitti
'non-
excep
to ho
nized
backg
tions
tical
usefu
concl
than

because *περί* with accusative in connexion with a noun can be virtually equivalent to a genitive, therefore in connexion with a verb it can be equivalent to the accusative of direct object. Other places where I disagree with the translation are 14 B, where *τὴν διαφορῶτητα τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τοῦ τ' ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ σοῦ* surely means 'the differentiation in my good and in yours', 45 E, where I think, in spite of 47 A 10, that *περί-*

βοητοῦς has a passive sense (see Jebb on Soph. *O.T.* 192), and 46 E, where the bare dative *ἀπορίας*, rendered by 'dans l'anxiété de ce tourment', seems to need emendation, and Burnet's *πυρίας* is perhaps to be accepted.

But these are comparatively small matters, and I would end by offering a warm welcome to this valuable book.

R. HACKFORTH.

Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

PLOTINUS

Études Plotiniennes: II. Les Manuscrits des Ennéades. Par Paul HENRY, S.J., Docteur ès Lettres. (Museum Lessianum, Section Philosophique, no. 21.) Pp. xlviii + 352. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer et Cie (Brussels: L'Édition Universelle), 1941.

THE first volume, *Les États du texte de Plotin* (1938), might well suggest to a reader that the textual criticism of Plotinus lagged far behind the discussion of his philosophy, even if the philosophical student were content to argue that, provided he were allowed the legitimate licence of an occasional emendation, he could get on well enough with Creuzer or Kirchhoff or Müller or Volkmann or Bréhier. Yet the study of Porphyry's 'Life of Plotinus' or the ebullient rhetoric of Volkmann's preface to his edition in the Teubner series might give pause, even apart from Père Henry's other writings on the subject, including his *Recherches sur la 'Préparation Évangélique' d'Eusèbe et l'édition perdue des œuvres de Plotin publiée par Eustochius* (1935), with which may be compared the second appendix in this new volume on the Eusebian-Plotinus excerpt in MS. Vat. Rossianus 986. Admitting that the reconstitution of a 'non-Enneadic' recension of Plotinus except in fragments may be too much to hope for, yet if it is ever to be recognized it will be best seen against the background of such laborious investigations in which, incidentally, the dialectical method is shown still to have its usefulness even if the evidence for the conclusions be at times less abundant than could be desired.

For the editor of the *Enneads* the establishment of a text dealing faithfully and intelligibly (not to say intelligently) with the complications of scholia, corrections, lacunae, etc., must necessarily depend primarily on *Ennead MSS.* In regard to these as here treated four groups are distinguished under the letters W (represented by 15 MSS.), X (5 MSS.), Y (23 MSS.), and Z (9 MSS.), with added notes on 'lost' ones. Each of the 52 MSS. in W X Y Z is described in turn with a patient minuteness of detail, which is soon found to be much less arid than it looks, and discussed with a pleasantly subacid estimate of copyists and correctors and redactors and their methods. The combination of description and comment with supplementary observations makes the book not only informative but even delectable for the bibliographer and bibliophile as well as for the palaeographer and textual critic. In view of the notes on the MS. authorities selected by editors it is to be observed that, as the result of the investigation, special importance is attached in W to E (Paris gr. 1976, s. xiii) and A (Laurent. 87. 3, membr., s. xiii); in X to B (Laurent. 85. 15, s. xiv), R (Reginen. 97, s. xiv), and J (Paris gr. 2082, s. xv); in Y to the twins CM (Monac. gr. 449, A.D. 1465 and Marc. gr. 240), U (Urbinas gr. 62, A.D. 1460) and S (Berol. gr. 375, s. xv); in Z to Q (Marc. gr. 242, s. xiv) and L (Ambros. gr. 667, s. xv-xvi). Since all these MSS. except A are written on paper, advantage is taken of the opportunity of checking judgements of dating on palaeographical grounds by

the subsidiary evidence derivable from comparison with the dates supplied or suggested by Briquet's great collection of 'Filigranes'. The discussions of the application and limitations of the method and the singular suggestiveness of the results in some cases are a remarkable feature of the book. It is unfortunate that it seems not to help in the case of the paper MS. D (Marc. gr. 209) in the Y group which Père Henry (with Zanetti and Müller) assigns to the twelfth century. If it be so in fact, it will call for much further study for other than textual reasons.

The last-named MS., which once belonged to Bessarion, has already provided occasion for a pretty little bit of archaeological research. It is, indeed, one of the advantages of the systematic plan followed that efforts to determine provenance and detailed accounts of owners and of the history and idiosyncrasies of scribes not only supply valuable biographical and technical details but also justify occasional observations *obiter* from which the student gains, besides the numerous additions to Briquet and corrections to printed catalogues, notes on bindings which may suggest, for example, an extension of identification of MSS. once in the library of Matthias Corvinus or palaeographical minutiae serving to supplement or correct Gardthausen's selection of the 'copiste capricieux et sot' of Paris gr. 1968 (G in Group Y) as the characteristic example of 'junge Minuskel', or his assignment of the appearance of iota with a single dot to western influence. Père Henry's findings are not infrequently at variance with those of others and his comments at times severe, but at least he provides materials for checking his judgement.

The reader will enjoy the wry twist to some of them, e.g. the description of Vat. gr. 239 'l'un des manuscrits les plus récents, les plus mauvais et les mieux connus de Plotin' or of the Oxford MS. Lincoln. gr. 32 'un manuscrit sans valeur mais non pas sans intérêt', for he is going to show that these two MSS. with Ambros. gr. 863 formed the basis for Perna's *editio princeps* in 1580. It is an admirable piece of demonstration, even if it does not rank in importance and difficulty with his very extensive investigation in this same volume of the problems connected with the translation by Marsilio Ficino, the basis assigned for it and the resultant effect on the characteristics of some later Greek MSS. of the Enneads—a subject which becomes now and then so intricate in its ramifications as to be a little difficult to follow, wherein it contrasts with the general lucidity of an austere enjoyable treatise.

The dedication of the book is 1938, its 'avant-propos' is signed as from 'Beyrouth nov. 1938; Rome jan. 1940', the imprimatur is Sept. 1940. The title-page is inscribed 1941 and the last page 'Imprimerie J. Duculot, Gembloux (Imprimé en Belgique)'. Such bibliographical details, relatively unimportant in normal times, raise interesting speculations how far printing and publication of works of the calibre of what its author calls 'cet austère volume' have been allowed to proceed under war conditions in enemy-occupied countries. If there have been many such the 'learned world' will have been more fortunate than hitherto there has seemed reason to hope.

CLAUDE JENKINS.

Christ Church, Oxford.

MARCUS AURELIUS

A. S. L. FARQUHARSON: *The Meditations of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus*. Edited with translation and commentary. 2 vols. Pp. lxxxiv + 1-432; 433-936. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1944. Cloth, 42s. net.

THE author of this splendid edition of the *Meditations* unhappily did not live to see its publication. Most of the first

volume, consisting of introduction, text, translation, and summary of the argument, was printed off before Farquharson's death in 1942; the second, comprising 470 pages of notes and elaborate indexes, was seen through the press by Major John Sparrow and Mr. David Rees, the former of whom, in a short preface, pays a graceful tribute to his

dead friend. Farquharson feared that he had performed his task inadequately, but no reader can possibly think so.

It is not known how the *Meditations* came to be published. Very little is heard of them until about A.D. 900, when Arethas of Patras, a disciple of Photius, tells how he presented Archbishop Demetrius with an old and tattered MS. of them, having previously had a new copy made for his own library. To other late Byzantine references to the philosophic Emperor given by Farquharson may be added an allusion in Psellus' Indictment of Michael Cerularius, *Μάρκον ἐκείνον τὸν ἐν βασιλείᾳ φιλοσοφῆσαντα* (Kurtz, p. 284, 22). The first edition of the *Meditations* was printed by Andreas Gesner in 1588-9 from a manuscript from the library of Otto Heinrich, Prince Palatine, which is unfortunately lost. The Greek text of this edition (P), to which was appended Xylander's faithful Latin translation, and cod. Vaticanus Graecus 1950 (A) are the sole authorities for the text as a whole, though there are many MS. collections of excerpts. Farquharson gives the highest praise to Thomas Gataker, 'whose edition (1652) will always remain the principal authority for anyone undertaking to study or edit the *Meditations*'.

The text of Marcus is not easy to correct, owing partly to the disconnected character of his self-communications, but Farquharson's labours have resulted in a text far easier to read than any to be found in previous editions. He makes a good many transpositions, and some of his emendations are most felicitous, e.g. 126. 1, *οὐ γὰρ ᾄξει αὐτὸ* (sc. *τὸ ἡγεμονικόν*) *εἰς κρίσιν τοιαύτην*, for *οὐ γὰρ ἔξεως κ.τ.λ.* (cf. Eur. *Ion* 328, *οὐδ' ἦξας εἰς ἔρευναν*); and 152. 10, *τὸ ἀποθανόν . . . διαλύεται εἰς τὰ <ἀ>ἴδια* (for which see the commentary) (cf. 184. 10, *τὸν <ἀ>ἴδιον αἰῶνα* Casaubon). At 180. 9, *ἦτις ἐὰν οὖν πράξις σου μὴ ἔχη κ.τ.λ.*, *ἐάν* should not have been left in the text, as N.T. parallels are poor support for such a solecism. At 226. 21 there is a first-rate emendation by Mr. Marchant (to whom the text, and indeed the work as a whole, owes much), *ἀλλ'*

ἢ τοι πρὸς μόνον (sc. *ἂν λέγοις*), 'just as you would address him, if alone', for *ἦτοι πρὸς μόνον*. At 106. 2 there is something wrong with *ἐρραγείς*, translated by 'in a rage', a form which Trannoy also prints with the comment 'dubium'; it seems, however, something worse than that. Read *ἐκπραγείς* with Schultz.

Farquharson's clear and graceful translation does full justice to the dignity of the original. It is fairly safe to say that the Emperor, like many other writers on morals, was as interested in the style as in the matter of his aphorisms. He was not a pupil of Fronto for nothing, and in an early letter to his master says '*itane, dicet aliquis, felicem te, si est qui te doceat quomodo γνώμην sollertius dilucidius brevius politius scribas*'. Occasionally in his notes Farquharson revises the translation printed in vol. i, but at 110. 14 there is an uncorrected slip. *οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται διαφέρεσθαι* does not mean 'the body cannot distinguish them itself', but 'it cannot even concern itself with them', 'car il ne saurait être troublé' (Trannoy), a meaning of *διαφέρεσθαι* which is copiously illustrated at 180. 24-5. At 208. 3, *οὐδὲ γὰρ αἶρεῖ λόγος μὴ τοιοῦτον* (sc. *ἀγαθόν*) *ὄντα*, the translation 'Reason, too, disowns one who is not like that' seems impossible. Supply *ζῆν*, as Farquharson himself suggests in his note, and translate 'Reason does not require you to live, if not like that'. If such a statement makes Marcus guilty of inconsistency, the reply is that philosophers are not always consistent, *οὐδ' ἐγγύς*.

After text and translation comes a brief life of Marcus, followed by some 160 pages of 'English commentary', which serves as a summary of contents and traces the sequence of thought. It is enlivened by a great number of apt quotations from modern as well as from ancient authors. Reference to this commentary would have been rendered easier for the reader, if the numbers of the books had been printed at the top of the pages. The lengthy 'Greek commentary' in Vol. II is a model of what such a commentary should be, and contains a magnificent collection of illustra-

tive and parallel passages from writers of all ages. It is printed, like the rest of the book, in beautifully clear type and with wide spacing such as one seldom sees nowadays. It is good to find that Farquharson does not excise the famous passage, *μὴ κατὰ ψυχὴν παράταξιν ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοί*. There are extraordinarily few topical allusions in the *Meditations*. Though the Emperor gives us detailed accounts of the principles which guided his actions, he tells us extremely little about the actions themselves.

One is likely to rise from a perusal of these noble *Meditations* with mixed feelings, including probably some sense of depression. Matthew Arnold said

that conduct was three-fourths of life; Marcus spoke as though it were the whole of life. No spiritual satisfaction in his eyes was worth anything unless it came of a good conscience. By the dreadful Stoic recipe given at 214. 21 he deliberately annihilates all aesthetic enjoyment. 'Withdraw into yourself', he says, not, however, to contemplate something beyond moral good and evil, but simply 'because the governing self is by its nature content with its own just actions and the tranquillity it thus secures'. Had Marcus been more of a mystic, he might have been, if not a happier, at least a more cheerful man.

J. H. SLEEMAN.

Royal Holloway College.

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY

Wilfred L. KNOX: *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity* (British Academy: Schweich Lectures, 1942). Pp. iv+108. London: Milford, 1944. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

STUDENTS of the New Testament, who know and value Dr. Knox's previous works, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem* and *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, will give a warm welcome to his Schweich Lectures. In these attention is concentrated mainly on the Gospels and Acts, particularly Luke-Acts and the Fourth Gospel. Besides the lectures themselves there are four additional detached notes on special points: the Infancy Narratives of the N.T. (pp. 22-5), the Speeches in Acts (25-9), Philo's Use of Sources (47-54), and Regeneration (90-4). In the lectures attention is drawn to some features in the earliest of the Gospels, which suggest that the influence of Hellenistic thought and speech was already at work in the period before Mark was written (pp. 1-6). A more detailed study of Luke-Acts occupies pp. 7-22; and here, perhaps more than anywhere else in the book, one wishes that the author had had more space to develop his theme. The examination of specimen *pericopae* of Luke in the light of Hellenistic rhetorical theory and practice gives results of the greatest interest to every serious student of the Synoptic Prob-

lem; but it whets an appetite which it does not fully satisfy. For once the issue has been raised, it is clear that nothing less than a thorough examination of the whole of Luke's writings on these lines will suffice. Such a work would be an invaluable complement to Cadbury's monograph on the style and literary methods of the Evangelist.

The largest part of the book (pp. 37-90) is devoted to the Fourth Gospel and the Logos doctrine. In this part of the book, and also in the comparison of Jewish and Christian propaganda methods as exemplified in Philo and Paul, Dr. Knox elaborates the main argument of these lectures. This is stated on p. 1 in these terms: 'The Gospel must be preached to all the world; it had therefore to be translated into the Greek language and accommodated to the general theological conceptions of the hellenistic world, and worked out into a coherent scheme of thought.' In this enterprise Christianity had a forerunner. Judaism had attempted to convert the Gentile world, and the importance of Philo is that he has preserved an immense amount of the Jewish propaganda material in which a hellenistic Jewish interpretation of the Old Testament and its faith was offered to the Greek world as a philosophical theology. Christian propaganda among the Gentiles followed similar lines. Paul and

John are not dependent on Philo. Rather all three draw on a common stock of interpretations of the Old Testament designed to prove that 'if properly understood, (it) revealed beneath a cloak of allegory the truths at which the great thinkers of Greece had only guessed' (p. 44).

As a bridge-conception between the Jewish and Christian religions on one side and the Stoic and Cynic philosophies on the other, *lógos* is of the highest importance. Dr. Knox brings out the points of contact in detail, showing, for example, how the Incarnate Logos of the Fourth Gospel might be linked up with the Stoic ideas about Heracles as *σωτήρ* and *λόγος*. These points of contact are important because their existence made it possible for Jew, Christian, and Stoic to suppose that when they used the term Logos, they meant much the same

thing. There were, however, fundamental differences, which persisted and still persist. A full statement of the case would require these to be brought into the account, and it would then appear what elements in the Hebrew conception of the Word of God failed to get across the *lógos*-bridge. But this would involve expanding Dr. Knox's work far beyond the limits of a course of Schweich Lectures.

As it is, the book is packed to overflowing with acute observation and wide-ranging learning, apt to inform and stimulate; and it is much to be desired that the author will pursue further lines of research here opened up and partly explored.

T. W. MANSON.

University of Manchester.

THE LETTERS OF ST. BASIL

Anders CAVALLIN: *Studien zu den Briefen des Hl. Basilius*. Pp. xii + 126. Lund: Gleerup, 1944. Paper.

THIS is a foretaste of studies towards a critical edition of the Letters of St. Basil. The accepted MS. classification of Bessières was based on the scope and order of the contents of MSS. Of the best, but hitherto uncollated, group the author has now made a full collation (not here published) of P (Patmius 57) and M (Marcianus 61), and has less exhaustively studied the remainder. War prevented investigation of MSS. of other groups, driving the author back upon the Benedictine apparatus, deceptive especially in its silence. In many respects, therefore, this work is admittedly tentative. The chief definite advances are these: P is dated early tenth century; S (Parisinus 334 S) is proved mainly a direct copy of M; the Benedictine 'Regius Secundus' is identified with C (Paris. 967); and the superiority of P and M is demonstrated by almost a hundred instances. Some other textual cruces are also discussed. Consideration of details is impossible in this review (e.g., Loeb, vol. ii, p. 156, l. 18: *ὅς* codd., edd.: *τίς* Cavallin: *τίς* *ὁ* scripserim), but the general verdict

must be conclusively in favour of the author. Although, even *flagrante delicto*, it is distasteful to disregard the maxim *audi alteram partem*, it is necessary to mention the author's hostile criticisms of the Loeb editor of Basil's Letters. Vol. i, it is shown, uncritically reproduces errors of the Benedictine text. The statements in Vols. ii, iii, iv that the contents of these volumes are not in A B C D F could not be true. Further, Vols. ii-iv are shown to be a reproduction of Migne's text, retaining some sixty palpable misprints, mostly intact, but a few further corrupted (by way of correction) by the Loeb editor or his revising editor. A misprint need not be evidence of an editor's intention or of his neglect; but the Loeb editor has several renderings of Migne's misprints, as at ii. 82. 10: *πόλεις ἀνευδεῶς* (Migne, for *ἀνευδεῶς*) *διάγουσαι*, 'cities which enjoy freedom from fear', and at ii. 440. 13: *συλήσας νῶν* (Migne, for *τῶν*) *παρθένων ὅσας ἠδύνατο*, 'Having stolen from us two as many of the virgins as he could'. The Loeb translation also, it is alleged, swarms with blunders, a charge well supported by examples. The author complains of the leniency of reviewers, including one in C.R. xlii. 149, but—

to do justice to that reviewer (though who is better able to do that for himself?)—it must be said that there, and later, he exposed errors calculated to inspire others with considerable mistrust of the Loeb translator. In a chapter on questions of authenticity, the author argues strongly for ascribing *Ep.* 38 to Greg. Nyss., 169, 170, 171 to Greg.

Naz., and 44 to an imitator of Greg. Naz.; and the book ends with illustrations of the possible value of 'accentual cursus' as a criterion in these and also in textual problems. There are two indexes and a table of MSS.

P. B. R. FORBES.

University of Edinburgh.

WHAT IS A CLASSIC?

T. S. ELIOT: *What is a Classic?* Pp. 32. London: Faber, 1945. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

THIS, the first annual address, delivered by its first President, to the newly founded Virgil Society, sets a challenging, even an alarming, standard for Mr. Eliot's successors. It is the work of a trained critic who is also a poet; of a critic well and widely read, no longer subjugated by the yoke of his learning, with judgement both acute and balanced; of a poet who shares at least some of the qualities of the poet of whom he writes. It is full of matter, ordered by hard thinking, and presented with grace.

And yet? Is there something a trifle bloodless about it all, an air of withdrawal from the world of men into the world of letters? Some readers will think that *tenuitas* in the good sense draws sometimes dangerously near to tenuity in the bad. When they are told that a consciousness of Virgil's 'refinement of manners springing from a delicate sensibility' makes Catullus seem a 'ruffian', and Horace 'somewhat plebeian' by comparison, they may be tempted to thank God that they are still crude enough to be kindled by passion and stirred by Regulus' return to Carthage. When they are told that 'to a sensitive palate the difference between the prose of Addison and Swift will be as marked as the difference between two vintage wines to a connoisseur', they may be inclined to say that even a palate which can tell mild from bitter can also tell chalk from cheese. And they will notice with interest two sentences in the address:

'We may expect a language to approach maturity at a moment when it has a critical sense of the past, a confidence in the present, and no conscious doubt of the future'; and 'an exhaustible language is the kind which may produce a classic poet'. A language to Mr. Eliot is something different from what it is to most of us: it can have a critical sense, and it can produce a poet.

But these are small points, and the address as a whole is a powerful exposition of what Mr. Eliot means by a 'classic' and of his reasons for holding Virgil to be a 'universal classic'. And he ends with a passage so notable, and noble, that it makes us forget what in earlier pages has irritated us and remember only what we have admired (though even here Mr. Eliot speaks of 'a literature' and not of the men who wrote it):

'I have spoken of the new seriousness—*gravity* I might say—the new insight into history, illustrated by the dedication of Aeneas to Rome, to a future far beyond his living achievement. His reward was hardly more than a narrow beach-head and a political marriage in a weary middle age: his youth interred, its shadow moving with the shades the other side of Cumae. And so, I said, one envisages the destiny of ancient Rome. So we may think of Roman literature: at first sight, a literature of limited scope, with a poor muster of great names, yet universal as no other literature can be; a literature unconsciously sacrificing, in compliance to its destiny in Europe, the opulence and variety of later tongues, to produce, for us, the classic. It is sufficient that this standard should have been established once for all: the task does not have to be done again. But the maintenance of the standard is the price of our freedom, the defence of freedom against chaos.'

M. R. RIDLEY.

Balliol College, Oxford.

A NEW FRENCH EDITION OF THE *PERVIGILIUM VENERIS*

La Veillée de Vénus: Pervigilium Veneris. Texte établi et traduit par Robert SCHILLING. (Collection Budé.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1944. Paper, 30 fr.

A FRENCH scholar, Pierre Pithou, in 1579 discovered the *Pervigilium Veneris* in the *codex Thuanus* and published its *editio princeps*. Another French scholar, Claude de Saumaise, in August 1619, first mentioned his discovery of the same poem in the *codex Salmasianus*. These are the two most important events in the bibliographic history of the *Pervigilium Veneris*, and in both French scholars were concerned. Since then, however, few notable additions to the study of this fascinating lyric have been made in France. It is, therefore, a great pleasure to see a French scholar of to-day treading in the footsteps of his distinguished predecessors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and our pleasure becomes admiration, when we note that M. Schilling's *avant-propos* is dated 'Paris: septembre, 1943'; and that his book was published at Paris in 1944 under the patronage of the Association Guillaume Budé. Not even the horrors of the last five years have been able to extinguish the torch of classical learning which French scholarship still holds high above the surrounding devastation.

Schilling's edition has two principal aims: the defence of the text as transmitted by the MSS., and an attempt to prove that the *Pervigilium Veneris* was written in the second century A.D. by P. Annii Florus.

His defence of the MSS. rests upon four expedients. (1) He conjectures lacunae both before and after line 58. But such a conjecture seems more, not less, drastic than to suppose that line 58 was accidentally misplaced and that it should be transposed, as many editors do, to precede line 40, which likewise was accidentally omitted by the *codex Thuanus*, although not by the other two MSS. (2) Schilling translates *tunc* in line 9 'à pareil jour'; but this is a mistranslation, for *tunc* in the position

given it by the MSS. can only refer to *cras*, four times emphatically repeated in the four preceding lines. Either, therefore, we must suppose another lacuna before line 9, or resort to rearrangement of the text. I prefer the latter alternative. (3) Schilling translates *ipsa* in line 63: 'C'est Vénus qui'; but this again is a mistranslation; for *ipsa*, in the context in which the MSS. place it, must refer to *Tellus*. This fact was well pointed out by a French scholar, Jean Bouhier, in 1737 (see the quotation from him in footnote 2 at page 49 of my 1936 edition of the *Pervigilium Veneris*). Here again the only alternatives are to suppose yet another lacuna or to transfer lines 59-62 to a position different from that given to them by the MSS. (4) Schilling has not given sufficient weight to the awkwardness of lines 59-62 in their MSS. context. It is most improbable that in a short poem of less than a hundred lines the author would have postponed till line 59 his explanation of the reason why the day, whose dawn must end the Vigil, will be so high a festival. Both here and in line 9 Schilling's French translation is *camouflage* of the very real confusion of thought in the Latin text as transmitted by the MSS. In my opinion, therefore, Schilling has not proved the sequence of lines given in the MSS. to be correct; and I adhere to the theory as to the genesis of their corruption set out at pages 53-4 of my 1936 edition.

With respect to Schilling's argument that the *Pervigilium Veneris* was written by P. Annii Florus in the second century A.D., it is far from certain that this rhetorician, who wrote the lost treatise entitled *Vergilius orator an poeta*, and who was born in Africa in or about A.D. 74, is the same person as either (a) the historian, whose name is variously written in the MSS. as 'Iulius Florus', 'Annaeus Florus', and 'L. Anneus Florus', or (b) the poet, whose fragments have been put together by Arnold M. Duff in *Minor Latin Poets* (Loeb Classical Library, 1935) at pages 423-35. Florus was not an uncommon name.

Ten persons of that name are enumerated in Pauly-Wissowa's *Realencyclopädie*, vol. vi, columns 2760-71. Moreover, this conjecture as to authorship must be considered with reference to the position occupied by the *Pervigilium Veneris* in the *Anthologia Latina*, which was undoubtedly compiled at Carthage in the reign of Thrasamund, king of the Vandals (A.D. 496-523). In this compilation the *Pervigilium Veneris* stood at the head of Book XVII, which contained in all 22 sets of verses; but none of them is stated to be the work of Florus (see page 38 of my 1936 edition). There was, however, in Book XIII one poem (No. 87 in Riese's edition of the *Anthologia Latina*) superscribed 'Flori'; and it is possible that the two following poems (Nos. 88 and 89 in Riese's edition) should also be attributed to this 'Florus'. But there is no evidence at all that the three immediately preceding poems (No. 84 'De rosis', No. 85 'De rosa', and No. 86 'De rosis') were the work of 'Florus'. They stand at the beginning of Book XIII; and the name of the author of No. 84 was unfortunately omitted by the copyist, who superscribed both Nos. 85 and 86

'Eiusdem'. As, however, No. 87 is superscribed 'Flori', not 'Eiusdem', the presumption is that the three preceding poems were *not* the work of 'Florus'. In Book XXI of the *Anthologia Latina* (which begins with Riese's No. 232), Nos. 245-52 inclusive entitled 'De qualitate vitae', are superscribed 'Flori' in one MS., but 'Floridi' in the other. Both Floridus and Floridius were Roman names: see Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie*, vol. vi, column 2759; and I believe that the name of the author of the verses 'De qualitate vitae' was not Florus, but either Floridus or Floridius. Anyway the evidence of the *Anthologia Latina* makes it very unlikely that the *Pervigilium Veneris* was written by a 'Florus'; and my impression is that its anonymous author lived at Carthage and in Sicily during the reign of Geisairix, king of the Vandals, and that for this reason the poem was included in the *Anthologia Latina*.

I doubt whether any absolutely convincing statement as to the text, the date, or the authorship of the *Pervigilium Veneris* can be made, unless and until new evidence is discovered.

C. CLEMENTI.

THE TEXT OF SENECA

Bertil AXELSON: *Neue Senecastudien*. (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N.F., Avd. 1, Bd. 36, Nr. 1.) Pp. viii+243. Lund: Gleerup, 1939. Paper, Kr. 8.

MR. AXELSON is already known as an able critic of the text of Seneca's prose, and this new work of his, which consists of a number of textual notes on the *Epistulae Morales* together with a few on the *Dialogi*, *De Beneficiis*, and *Naturales Quaestiones*, is a valuable contribution to scholarship. Mr. Axelson makes some admirable conjectures, as, for example, *inpotentiam* for *potentiam* in *Ep.* 36. 1 'alios in aliud irritat, hos in potentiam, illos in luxuriam' and *ponderi servit* for *pondere serpit* in *Ep.* 40. 7 'incitato corporis pondere serpit ac longius quam uoluit effertur'. But he is less often concerned with advocating a new conjecture than with using his power of analysis and apt quotation in

support of a particular choice among manuscript readings or existing conjectures. He knows what he is at and he is well aware that some who in this century have edited or written on Seneca have no proper notion of what textual criticism is. One would gladly see his book, especially, but not only, for its first chapter 'Zur Einführung in die Senecakritik', in the hands of a young student eager to learn and to school himself as a critic.

It contains a few errors of fact as well as some of judgement, and also some oversights. For example, on p. 158 Mr. Axelson doubts whether *sapere ad* is ever found: see, for one example, Terence, *Adelphi* 832. On p. 188 he says he finds no record in the lexica of exclamatory *quomodo*: he should look again at Georges, Lewis and Short, Smith, White and Riddle, and Forcel-

lini.
'mi
unv
or F
says
Sen
agai
quia
by q
do r
27. 3
eigen
pose
all t
Axel
by d
alrea
secti
Hor.
quot
The
11. 1
15. 1
of M
not r
punc
is as
that
N.Q.
recen
quam
Hens
editio
parall
adduc

P. DE
risc
Ma
Gro
f. 3
Mr. 1
earlier
Ammi
p. 150
in his
the bo
and o
The bi
good
from
althou
an inc

lini. Discussing *N.Q.* v. 15. 4 he says 'mir wenigstens ist ein uentos *inanes* unverstündlich': see Virg. *Aen.* x. 82 or Plin. *N.H.* ii. 103. On p. 82 he falsely says that *adtempero* occurs only in Seneca and Vitruvius. On p. 147 and again on p. 172 he says that in Seneca *quid aliud* is followed not by *nisi* but by *quam*; but notice *Dial.* iii. 11. 1. I do not know why *uadoso* in *Dial.* vii. 27. 3 is said to be 'unbestreitbar etwas eigentümlich'. The punctuations proposed at *Epp.* 77. 18, 87. 10, and 88. 3 are all to be seen in Summers's text. Mr. Axelson defends *corpori* in *Ep.* 90. 19 by quoting *De Clem.* i. 3. 5 which is already quoted by Summers, and on section 93 of the same letter he quotes Hor. *Sat.* ii. 2. 77-9 which is already quoted by Summers with Persius ii. 61. The punctuation proposed at *Dial.* x. 11. 1 is to be seen in Duff's text, and at 15. 1 in the same work the conjecture of Muretus is also in Duff's text and is not read only by Koch and Gertz. The punctuation proposed at *Dial.* xi. 7. 1 is as old as Bentley. Mr. Axelson says that recent editors adopt *numquam* at *N.Q.* i. praef. 13, but in fact the most recent editor, Oltramare, adopts *nusquam*. It is said that at *Ep.* 119. 10 Hense accepts *id*, but on p. 634 of his edition Hense rejects it. Mr. Axelson's parallel of *Dial.* iii. 1. 2 was long ago adduced by Bourguery. Mr. Axelson says

that recent editors do not mention *effugeris* at *Ep.* 78. 6, but in fact Thomas observes 'on attendrait plutôt *effugeris*'. At *Ep.* 85. 29 *uulnera* is the reading of Patav. 913. It is said that editors have not noticed that *Carthaginiis horror* in *Ep.* 86. 4 is from Lucr. iii. 1034: Thomas, Summers, and Gummere all note the fact. On p. 217 Mr. Axelson calls the position of the adjectives 'auffällig' in *Dial.* vi. 3. 2 *gratumque extremi sermonem oris*. It is not so rare as he and others suppose. Here are some examples: Cic. *Phil.* ii. 166, *Tusc.* iv. 7, Livy vi. 34. 7, x. 46. 4, xlv. 28. 15, Sen. *Ep.* 86. 6, Plin. *N.H.* viii. 52, x. 3, Quint. x. 1. 41, x. 1. 81, Tacitus *Dial.* 12. 3, 31. 5, *Ann.* i. 10. 1, and to these, in view of what Mr. Axelson says on p. 182, I add examples containing a demonstrative pronoun in Cic. *de orat.* i. 27 and Livy x. 41. 3.

There are a few wrong references. For instance, on p. 154, xi. 14. 6 should be ix. 14. 6, and on p. 228, 83. 1 should be 81. 3. In the bibliography Basore's edition of the Moral Essays is given as in two volumes instead of in three, the volume of selections by Thomas is given in the second edition of 1903 instead of in the twelfth edition of 1928, and Duff's edition of the last three of the *Dialogi* is not mentioned.

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS

P. DE JONGE: *Sprachlicher und historischer Kommentar zu Ammianus Marcellinus XIV.* 7-11. Pp. 148. Groningen: Wolters, 1939. Stiff paper, f. 3.50.

MR. DE JONGE's commentary on the earlier part of the fourteenth book of Ammianus was noticed in *C.R.* I (1936), p. 150. The only difference of character in his commentary on the remainder of the book is that the notes on language and on history are no longer separate. The bibliography of fifteen pages makes good none of the criticized omissions from the former bibliography, and, although it includes many items like an index Apuleianus, Dalmeida's edi-

tion of Longus, and Lindsay's *Syntax of Plautus*, it is without such works as G. B. Pighi's *Nuovi Studi Ammiane* and *I Discorsi nelle Storie d'Ammiano Marcellino*, which were both published in 1936. Mr. de Jonge's work is not a critical and systematic commentary, but a useful collection of material and bibliographical references on special points. For instance, something is said about the usage of words like *heiulo*, *praecentor*, *interscindo*, *rebellatrix*, *efficacia*, *impetrabilis*, *interpateo*, *internus*, *portuosus*, *turbela*, *subolesco*, *cruciabilis*, and *ergastularius*; but Mr. de Jonge is so unmethodical that nothing at all is said about other words like *localis*,

laniatus, pulsata with *maiestas, incanto, recalcitro, diuarico, dilancino, perspicabilis, sospitalis, contermino, exitialis, oblatro, consarcino, excarnifico, perurgeo, exsudo, succinctius, obstaculum, adulabilis, iniecto, circumstridens, praeseputus, praemiatrix, substantialis, partilis, and insolubilis*. Sometimes he is misleading. For instance, at 7. 8 he says *uigor* occurs in Seneca, Pliny, Petronius, Tacitus, and Apuleius, and says nothing of Livy, Vitruvius, Curtius, and Quintilian. *Heiulo* occurs at 7. 17 and not twice, but at least three times, elsewhere in Ammianus. At 8. 2 he calls *rebellatrix* 'rare' and *internicius* 'very rare', as if the former were commoner than the latter. At 8. 15 he quotes Cic. in *Verr.* iii. 182 and *pro Balbo* 61 but not *de lege agr.* ii. 36 and *de prou. cons.* ii. At 11. 24 he says that *cruciabiliter* occurs in Plautus and Ammianus as if it did not in *bell. Afr.* and in Ausonius.

Textual notes are few and of little value. Manuscript readings are not always given when they are rejected and are given wrongly at 7. 4, 7. 9, and 10. 12. At 7. 5 and 7. 6 Mr. de Jonge compares the very passage on which he is commenting. I have noticed nearly forty misprints and wrong references.

Some of the notes which the commentary should include are the following: 7. 12 *uocis obiurgatorio sonu* Gell. ix. 2. 3; 21 *turbidum ingenium* Tac. Ann. xiv. 59. 4; 8. 5 *pelagi fragoribus* Virg. Aen. i. 154; 9. 5 *in eodem gradu constantiae stetit* xvi. 2. 3, Val. Max. iv. 7. 1; 10. 5 *opera consulla* xxix. 1. 3, Gell. vii. 17. 3; 11. 3 *favorabiles aetate* Florus ii. 15. 4; 11. 27 *ipse sui pertaesus* Suet. Tib. lxxvii. 1 *semet ipse pertaesus*.

There are several false statements concerning Latin words. For instance, p. 17 *onerousus* is not found in classical prose; p. 25 it is said that Ammianus does not use *fatidicus* of things, but on the contrary he does not use it of persons; p. 34 *superuacuius* is not only poetic and post-Augustan; p. 44 *baiulus* is said to be unclassical, but it occurs

at least four times in Cicero; p. 79 *nauiger* is used in prose before the younger Pliny; p. 100 Livy does not use *impatiens* with a genitive; p. 119 *licet* with an imperfect subjunctive is as early as *Bell. Hisp.* 16. 3. Some mistakes are repeated from others. For instance, p. 22 the statement is quoted concerning *conculco* 'uitant politiores scriptores', but it occurs at least six times in the speeches of Cicero; p. 46 Ammianus does not always use *cognomentum*, for he has *cognomen* at xxix. 1. 39; p. 71 *adclinis* occurs before Virgil; p. 118 *mando* with an accusative and infinitive is as early as Virgil; p. 120 Ammianus does not always use *febris* in the plural, for he uses it in the singular at xxi. 15. 2. One other error I will speak of. In *Thes. Ling. Lat.* iii. 896 Burger cites no example of *certo* with an infinitive in classical prose except Sallust, *Iugurtha* 94. 6. That passage is as follows: 'eo acrius Romani instare, fundere ac plebsque tantum modo sauciare, dein super occisorum corpora uadere, auidi gloriae certantes murum petere, neque quemquam omnium praeda morari.' There is no example of *certo* with an infinitive there any more than there is one in 44. 5 'lixae permixti cum militibus diu noctuque uagabantur et palantes agros uastare, uillas expugnare, pecoris et mancipiorum praedas certantes agere eaque mutare cum mercatoribus uino aduecticio et aliis talibus, praeterea frumentum publice datum uendere, panem in dies mercari.' Mr. J. B. Hofmann in the fifth edition of Stolz-Schmalz's *Lateinische Grammatik*, p. 581, shows that he has either not verified the reference in the *Thesaurus* or misunderstood the passage of Sallust; and now Mr. de Jonge, on p. 69 of his work, shows that he is in the same position as Mr. Hofmann. The error has secured a long start; but let it be said that the first prose writers to use *certo* with an infinitive are Curtius and Seneca.

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

GREEK GENEALOGICAL CHRONOLOGY

Donald Wilson PRAKKEN: *Studies in Greek Genealogical Chronology*. Pp. 113. Privately printed (Lancaster Press, Lancaster, Pa.), 1943. Paper.

MR. PRAKKEN has done a useful piece of work by a systematic study of the Greek concept of a 'generation' of men, *yeved*, from Homer and Hesiod to the historians who used it in order to establish an agreed chronology for the early periods of Greek history. After a chapter on 'The Generation in Early Greek Literature' (Homer, Hesiod, and the Lyric poets), he has three more on Herodotus, Thucydides (in the *Archaeologia* and the notes on the Greek colonization of Sicily), and Ephorus, in which he concludes that Herodotus used for certain early dates Hecataeus' generation of 40 years though he himself said that three generations covered 100 years, that Thucydides' figures in the *Archaeologia* are probably based on a 40-years generation, and that Ephorus probably used one of 35 years. What one misses is a discussion of Hecataeus' figure; and what made Ephorus decide on 35 years? Did he use the known dates of Spartan kings, for example, for the 200 years or so before his own time? And what one could have done without are the pages about the composition of Thucydides' *Archaeologia*, the Spartan constitution (with reference to Thuc. i. 18. 1), and the date when Ephorus wrote, which are largely irrelevant to the author's purpose, and, as separate discussions, are inadequate.

In the application, however, of his conclusions Mr. Prakken (it seems to me) works on wrong principles. I have only space to note briefly a few instances of this. (1) Herodotus' inconsistency needs some discussion. He was often careless about chronology; but in this case his date for Heracles, which according to Mr. Prakken is Hecataeus' date, based on a 40-year generation, is given in the same context as his own statement of a 33½-year generation and his note on Hecataeus' date for the Greek gods (ii. 142-5). Hecataeus, one of the first historians to give to a generation a

definite number of years, must have done so explicitly, and it is remarkable if Herodotus was unconscious of the contradiction.

(2) Mr. Prakken thinks that Hellanicus followed Hecataeus both for the length of a generation and in dating the fall of Troy by means of the lists of Spartan kings, but differed from his predecessor in dating the fall ten years later. 'Hecataeus' starting point was presumably 490 B.C., the date of the first Persian invasion; while Hellanicus would probably have reckoned from 480 B.C., the date of the second Persian invasion.' But if Hellanicus made this correction it must have been in the form, 'Hecataeus was wrong in ending the generation of Cleomenes in the year of Marathon; it should rather be in the year of Thermopylae, when Leonidas, brother to Cleomenes, died.' And this is not a matter of words only; for Mr. Prakken, though he agrees that for the historical period, when the lengths of the reigns of Spartan kings, and their relationships to one another, were known, a simple reckoning by generations was impossible as well as unnecessary, yet argues that the historians reckoned Leonidas and Leotychidas as of another generation from Cleomenes and Demaratus, though they all knew that they were of the same. Certainly when Herodotus was tracing the genealogies of Leonidas and Leotychidas (vii. 204 and viii. 131. 2) he made no such mistake.

(3) In discussing whether Ephorus used a 35- or a 33½-years generation Mr. Prakken says that, if he used the latter, 'the generation of Leonidas and Leotychidas, falling 600 years after 1070 B.C., would end in 470 B.C. [instead of 475, which he assumes (wrongly, I am sure) to be Ephorus' date for the death of Leotychidas], but stress need not be laid upon this factual error which is unavoidable in genealogical reckoning'. On the contrary, the whole meaning, in genealogical reckoning, of such an exact date for Eurysthenes and Procles as 600 years before some given date such as the death of Leotychidas, is that 600 is an

exact multiple of the accepted length of a generation; errors are excluded, because the figure is only obtained by multiplication. Still more clearly: 'in those passages [in Thucydides] pertaining to the colonization of Sicily, the basis for reckoning may be a system of genealogical chronology; but nothing definite can be said about the length of the generation there employed.' The reason why nothing definite can be said is that there is no common factor for the figures which Thucydides gives; but without a common factor, how can the

basis of reckoning possibly be genealogical?

Much more work, in fact, needs to be done before, if ever, we obtain a satisfactory statement of the various Greek systems of early chronology. Mr. Praken might well have given more space to a discussion of the views of some of his predecessors, particularly Beloch, Jacoby and A. R. Burn (whose work he apparently does not know); but his book will be useful as a basis for further discussion.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

ROMAN HISTORY

Arthur E. R. BOAK: *A History of Rome to 565 A.D.* (Third Edition). Pp. xiii + 552; 13 plates, 12 maps. New York:

The Macmillan Co., 1943. Cloth, \$4.50. This volume, printed, bound, and illustrated with a solid elegance to inspire the envious admiration of starved publishers on this side of the Atlantic, is a second revision of a work first published in 1921 by the Professor of Ancient History in the University of Michigan, and the fact that it has been called for is a true and sufficient indication of its quality. It is larger by at least a third than the first edition (the second, of 1929, I have not seen) and several sections have been entirely rewritten to embody the results of Roman studies in the last twenty years—for instance (to give examples at random) on the course and motives of Roman policy in Greece and Asia in the second century B.C., and on the disintegration and recovery of the Empire in the third A.D.: thus, in the latter, Professor Boak has adopted Alföldi's view (*C.A.H.* xii. 5) that the chief credit for the defeat of the Goths is rightly due to Gallienus, not to Claudius Gothicus, who merely disposed of the fragments of the invaders after Gallienus had broken them at Naissus. Its usefulness both to undergraduates and to the 'general reader' will be greatly enhanced by the detailed lists of 'supplementary readings', which are restricted to works in English. (By

the way, Collingwood and Myres's vol. i of the *Oxford History of England* and Macdonald's *Roman Wall in Scotland* should be mentioned in the note to ch. xix.) Throughout, the writing is admirably clear, economical, and judicious, and the proportion between political, social, and economic aspects is skilfully maintained. Less successful, perhaps, are the sections on Latin literature, which are little more than catalogues of names with more or less appropriate epithets. Within the limits imposed upon a book of this kind, literary history can hardly be other than perfunctory, or give much satisfaction to either the writer or his readers.

Apart from this, it would not be easy to imagine a better book of its kind; and it surpasses most of its kind especially in its scope, since it goes on to Justinian, and introduces the undergraduate to the facts and problems of the Christian Empire, of which he is apt to be left completely unaware.

In point of sheer factual and verbal accuracy, not even so learned and careful a writer as Professor Boak can wholly escape from slipping. A few small points, noted more or less accidentally, may be mentioned for possible consideration in yet another edition: P. 101: is the position of Polybius among the Achaean deportees in Italy correctly designated as that of a 'political refugee'? He and the others had

been denounced to the Romans by the faction of Callicrates, but had they been condemned and exiled by the Achaean congress? P. 133: was Italica founded as a 'Latin colony', not a *c. civium Romanorum*? P. 202: the Senate after Sulla's dictatorship 'arrogated to itself what had previously been a prerogative of the Assembly, namely, the right of selecting any person whatever to exercise military *imperium* in any sphere determined by itself'. But the definition of *provinciae* had surely always been a right of the Senate, and the Senate's choice of commanders was surely restricted to persons *cum imperio*? P. 238: Marcus Marcellus, pardoned by

Caesar after Thapsus, was consul in 51 B.C.—not 50 B.C., when the consulate was held by his cousin Gaius, husband of Caesar's grand-niece Octavia. (The other Gaius, consul in 49, was Marcus' brother.) P. 322: Hadrian's 'permanent substitution of equestrians for freedmen as chiefs of the great secretarial bureaux in charge of the *fiscus* . . .' (as in *V. Hadr.* 22) is at least doubtful. The *equus* Villius Lepidus was *procurator a rationibus* under Trajan, and the T. Aurelius Aphrodisius of *I.L.S.* 1475, who was *Aug. lib.* and *proc. Aug. a rationibus*, is obviously later than Hadrian.

A. F. GILES.

University of Edinburgh.

KOUROI

Kouroi. A Study of the Development of the Greek Kouros from the late seventh to the early fifth century B.C. By Gisela M. A. RICHTER, with the co-operation of Irma A. RICHTER; with 208 photographs by Gerard M. YOUNG. Pp. xxi+428; 135 plates (483 figures). New York: Oxford University Press (London: Milford), 1942. Cloth, 84s. net.

THIS is a very important book. It is well known that we are far better off for *originals* in the archaic period of Greek sculpture than in any other period. The dominant type of substantive statue in the archaic period is the 'kouros'. Large numbers of kouros have been preserved, and almost every year sees additions: there are over 150 in Miss Richter's list, some mere fragments, but others almost entire. As they are nearly all recent discoveries they have not been falsified by restorations. Another advantage to the archaeologist is that the troublesome question of original and ancient copy does not arise in dealing with kouros: some copies or imitations exist, but with hardly any exception they are so poor as to be unmistakable. We have, then, a large class of Greek originals in fine condition and mostly of high quality. Moreover, the subject is the same throughout—they are all naked figures in the same attitude—so that it is far

simpler to compare one with another than it would be otherwise.

Miss Richter is not the first to study the 'kouros' as a whole: she pays generous tribute to *Les Apollons archaïques* of her predecessor Deonna. But the material has greatly increased since 1909; much has been learnt about archaic art, and it would be strange and discreditable if methods had not improved.

Miss Richter neglects no means: but her chief approach is anatomical. The anatomy of the kouros has been studied before, but comparatively casually, never so deeply and systematically as here. The general movement from the rise of monumental sculpture in the seventh century down to the end of the archaic period (when the kouros disappears, yielding to new kinds of statue) was from a formal representation of the human body towards a soberly naturalistic. Miss Richter arranges the kouros in six groups according to the degree of naturalism attained; and her arrangement is convincing. It is not a matter of impression only: each piece is analysed, every feature given attention, nothing slurred: and the book provides the reader, among other things, with a better introduction to human anatomy, from the archaeological standpoint, than he will find anywhere else.

The arrangement constitutes a real

series; and the series must correspond to a chronological sequence. Some sculptors must have been more conservative than others: but the general progress in anatomical knowledge was uniform. 'The different parts developed together. A statue with a primitive and stylized skull and ear and eye will be found to have also a primitive and stylized chest and back and knee. A statue with a more naturalistic skull and ear will also have a more naturalistic back and knee.' It is only natural that there should be a few slight exceptions and some transitional pieces: but 'in no instance do we find really late features in a really early scheme (in spite of the fact that a completely naturalistic model was continuously present in every human being)'. This general uniformity of development can be observed in vase-painting also—where the investigator can apply more checks than in sculpture, can control his 'anatomical order' by examining the vases from the point of view of shape, of patternwork, and so on.

It is clear that if the kouroi can be arranged in a chronological order, the consequences for the study of other kinds of archaic sculpture are very important: female figures, architectural decoration. The Chrysaor of the Temple in Corfu corresponds to this group of Kouroi, the Theseus of the Temple at Eretria to that. In female figures there is much that can hardly be compared: but the head can, the feet, the hands, the set of the arms. The kouros furnishes a standard to which all archaic sculpture may be referred.

The six groups cut across local divisions. Deonna went far in attributing kouroi to local groups, but subsequently retracted many of his attributions. Miss Richter recognizes that the kouroi of eastern Greece—Greek Asia Minor and the islands close to the coast, especially Samos and Rhodes—differ in character from those of more westerly Greece: but beyond that she is chary of ascribing a kouros to a particular local school. Inscriptions, as well as historical records, prove that sculptors travelled widely.

Although anatomy is the keynote of

the book, other matters are dealt with fully: technique, use, interpretation. There is a valuable section on the mounting of kouroi—plinths and bases: without considering the mounting, one cannot form a correct image of the complete object. Such evidence as there is for the absolute chronology of each group is also examined. Under interpretation, the representations of archaic images on late coins might, perhaps, have been mentioned: the Apollo of Tektaios and Angelion, from the point of view of form, was a kouros; the Dioskouroi by Hermon of Trozen were kouroi, and early ones (Imhoof-Blumer and Gardner, *Numismatic Commentary to Pausanias*, pl. M, vii and p. 48; clearer, Hitzig and Blümner, pl. 17, 5); but these, and the Apollo of Kanachos, are really part of another inquiry.

Nearly every piece is illustrated, most of them in several views and many of them from fine new photographs by Mr. G. M. Young. There are 483 pictures in all: the 208 mentioned on the title-page are Mr. Young's only. The reproductions are nearly all good. One of the exceptions is the kouros from the Acropolis (figs. 322-4, 345, and 347), in which the contours have been strengthened: happily it is well reproduced in Payne and Young and in Schrader. No good photographs of Kleobis and Biton seem ever to have been taken. The chief omissions are the two Milani kouroi in Florence, which, owing to legal difficulties, have never been published or even exhibited. The great torso from Miletos in the Louvre is mentioned (p. 247), but not figured: Miss Richter may regard it as no longer quite a kouros, but there would be a good case for putting it in the series though at the end. The bronze torso from Leghorn in Florence, which resembles that from Miletos, is no doubt excluded for the same reason, but also perhaps because Kluge has shown it to be a copy. The process chosen is collotype: some think that half-tone gives a better result with sculpture, but collotypes, being printed on better paper, are more durable and have a more agreeable surface.

It may be asked whether some of the

pieces treated as 'forerunners' (pp. 41-6) should not have formed a first group of kouroi, preceding the Sounion group. The small bronze from Delphi (figs. 12-14) is surely already a proper kouros; and Miss Richter shows that two fragments of marble statues from Delos, approximately life-size (figs. 15-18), are in all probability from kouroi. It is only a chance that no fully preserved kouros of the Daedalic period has reached us so far.

The origin of the kouros has been sought in Crete: but Miss Richter argues for eastern Greece or the Cyclades. She

leans towards eastern Greece, influenced, perhaps, by Pliny's notice of the Chiot school: but the claim of the Cyclades seems at least as good. Besides the initial impulse from Egypt, Miss Richter is disposed to admit a measure of Assyrian influence, which appears less certain.

The wealth of information is skilfully arranged, and set forth in a clear and quiet style. Altogether this is one of the most excellent works on Greek art that have appeared in our time.

J. D. BEAZLEY.

Oxford.

ROMAN MEDALLIONS

Jocelyn M. C. TOYNBEE: *Roman Medallions*. (Numismatic Studies, No. 5.) Pp. 268; 49 plates. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1944. Paper boards, \$10.

ROMAN medallions were first made the subject of systematic study by W. Froehner in 1878; and F. Gnechi's sumptuous *corpus* appeared in 1912. Thereafter they tended to be neglected, possibly as a result of the immense strides made in the scientific arrangement of the regular Roman imperial coinage, until the discovery of the gold medallions of Arras once more turned attention to the interest—and the problems—displayed by such pieces. Miss Toynbee has re-examined the whole question of Roman medallions in all metals—their relation to the regular coinage, their mints and provenances, the occasions for their production, and the part which they played in political, religious, and artistic expression. She claims that the work is to be considered only as the preliminary to a new *corpus* which she has in hand. But on its own merits the book is a notable one. Its argument is presented with a breadth and a scholarship which mark the standard work of future years; and the author's extensive travels before the war (the list of the collections examined is imposing: note that the Evans bequest to Oxford is an integral part of the Ashmolean collection) have supplied a mass of new material which, illustrated on 49 excellent plates, makes the book in a sense a supplement to Gnechi.

Students have always treated medallions with caution, due in part to a faulty understanding of the system by which the imperial mints were controlled. Medallions were struck in gold, silver, and *aes*: *aes* was characteristic of the period up to c. A.D. 250, after which gold and silver became the more common. The types employed (in all three metals) are redolent of the Emperor's prestige or achievement: production took place at mints, and in circumstances, intimately related to the imperial coinage. But though in these respects medallions approximated to the imperial coinage, in others they were set apart. For their weights are generally abnormal: their style shows special workmanship and methods of production: their types often involve a knowledge of history and mythology not found in the common man: and their appearance might be enhanced by decorative mounting, framing, or structure. It follows that medallions were essentially pieces produced at imperial instigation for presentation on special occasions (e.g. the New Year) to persons of rank and culture; and though some of the later examples in gold and silver were related in weight to the normal gold and silver denominations, it remains true that most gold and silver medallions, and nearly all the *aes*, were originally regarded as lying outside the structure of the regular coinage.

Equally truly, however, they were produced at the regular mints: in the case of the later medallions this is

indeed shown by mint-marks, and some of the earlier medallions in *aes* share dies with regular coins. Thus two main problems arise. First, between the regular coinage and medallions proper lies a class of mainly first-century *aes* 'pseudo-medallions'—'pieces differentiated from coins solely by structural, external, and, in a sense, superficial features' (p. 25) which scarcely lift them out of the category of coins. Though these are rightly explained as the forerunners of the *aes* medallions proper inaugurated by Trajan and Hadrian, it may be felt that the treatment accorded to them is perhaps inadequate, and that the structure of the first-century mints and coinage is not fully appreciated: thus the Agrippa-type *dupondii* are not Augustan (p. 25); and the Divus Augustus (thunderbolt) type should be specified as Tiberian (p. 26). In the second place there are the 'coins incorrectly classed as medallions' (pp. 28 ff.), and 'medallic coins' (p. 32 f.). Here much difficulty centres round the absence or presence of the S(enatus) C(onsulto) normally seen upon *aes* of the Senatorial mint; and once more the regular coinage has received less than its due of appreciation (e.g. 'ordinary coin-style' (p. 29) is very lightly dismissed, but coin-style might and did vary greatly). Absence of SC should mean that the *imperator* never abrogated a right of striking in *aes*, as is certainly shown by Gaius' *adlocutio*-type *sestertii* (p. 28): presence of SC may stand *either* for free senatorial initiative in striking *aes* of a form approved by the Emperor, or for imperial encouragement of senatorially

struck *aes* brought to bear through imperial promotion of a *senatusconsultum*. In other words, the meaning of S(enatus) C(onsulto) varies infinitely, and it is impossible to lay down general rules, as the SC *aes* of Nero struck at Lugdunum should remind us. SPQR, followed by a dedicative dative in honour of the Emperor or his relatives, is virtually the same as SC (p. 29), whether or not it is reinforced by the gentler EX SC; and the EX SC gold and silver of Nero's early reign shows not the 'close association of Emperor and Senate' (p. 29), or 'a desire to preserve the tradition of senatorial collaboration in the coinage at a time when no *aes* was issuing' (p. 47), but the definite (if still polite) assertion of senatorial claims to control the gold and silver which since 12 B.C. had been out of its hands. In short the 'personality' of the mints must yet be better known if their behaviour is to be fully interpreted.

Miss Toynbee's sections on provenances, occasions for distribution, and recipients are admirable and suggestive; while her observations on the light thrown by medallions upon religion, politics, and art will command general support. This is, indeed, a work of high quality, necessary to both historian and numismatist: and we are encouraged to look forward to Miss Toynbee's new *corpus* in the days ahead when international facilities for study are once again available.

C. H. V. SUTHERLAND.

Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

MICHIGAN PAPYRI

Michigan Papyri. Vol. V. *Papyri from Tebtunis*, part II. By E. M. HUSSELMAN, A. E. R. BOAK, and W. F. EDGERTON. Pp. xix + 446; 6 plates. Vol. VI. *Papyri and Ostraca from Karanis*. By H. C. YOUTIE and O. M. PEARL. Pp. xxi + 252; 7 plates. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press (London: Milford), 1944. Cloth, \$5, \$4.

IN present circumstances America must take a larger burden than usual of the responsibility for maintaining classical

studies. In no sphere is this more apparent than in papyrology; indeed, America is almost the only country in which much work at documentary papyri is at the moment proceeding. And in America Ann Arbor is the most active centre. The two substantial volumes here reviewed are a striking testimony not only to the industry but to the very high standard of editorial competence maintained by the Michigan school of papyrologists.

Volume V continues the publication of the important and interesting group of papyri found at Tebtunis and acquired by the University of Michigan in 1921 and 1922. They formed the archives of the *grapheion* or record office of Tebtunis in the middle years of the first century A.D. The first part of the publication (C.R. xlviii. 149 f.) consisted of the registers and accounts of the *grapheion*. A few more papyri of this type, less extensive, appear in this Part, but the majority of the texts are the actual documents prepared in the *grapheion*. Some of these are complete, but a large number consist of subscriptions only, the body of the papyrus being left blank, with (in many cases) brief personal notes on the parties with a view to the full description (*εἰκονισμός*) to be inserted in the contract. In an important section of the introduction Mrs. Husselman discusses the question What was the purpose of such incomplete documents? She concludes, with great probability, that they were *ἐκδόσιμα* prepared for the parties but left by them at the *grapheion* (which was both notarial and record office). One complete document was kept by the *grapheion* for registration; other copies had only the subscriptions but could be completed at the request of the parties. Often the need did not arise, and the incomplete copies remained in the office.

All sorts of transactions are recorded in these documents, which thus provide a vivid picture of life and conditions in Tebtunis over a limited period of time (Tiberius–Claudius). Specially interesting is a group of texts relating to associations and guilds: 243, an ordinance of a guild the exact nature of which is uncertain owing to the loss of the earlier portion; 244, one of an association of *ἀπολύσιμοι οὐσίας Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος* (see the introduction); 245, one of salt merchants; 246, a list of contributions to a guild of Harpocrates; 247 and 248, lists of members of unnamed guilds.

A number of the contracts are in demotic, and it is for the editing of these that Professor Edgerton is responsible. The Greek subscriptions often

provide useful evidence for Greek phonetics, e.g. 249 (A.D. 18), *ωοῖως* = *ὁ υἱός* (?), *μει* = *με*, *υκοῖας* = *οἰκίας*, *ροῖμη* = *ρύμη*, *πασι* = *πάσῃ*. There is not space here to dwell on all the many points of interest in this volume, but reference may be made to sales of property by husband to wife (e.g. 272) as illustrating the position of women in Egypt, a lease of a private bath (312), with useful details, some extremely interesting divisions of property (e.g. 326, the unusually large number of slaves, 18 in all, 321 and 322, the latter attached to the accounts of a beer-shop under priestly control), a dating (345) by the *kratesis* of Caesar (A.D. 7–8), the use of *περί* for *ὑπέρ* (314. 7), and a contract for the planting of mulberry trees (349).

A majority of the papyri are well preserved, and the skill of the editors has left little for a reviewer to do in the way of correction. In the two petitions 228 and 229 the editor is certainly wrong in inserting the point after the date in ll. 10 and 8 respectively; it should be placed after *μερίδος* in l. 7 and *Ταλεί* in l. 4. In 229. 18 *λογοποιουμένου*, as Boak recognizes, clearly means 'calling to account', 'remonstrating'; is it not likely that it has this sense also in 228. 10? In 229. 26 Boak takes *προ[σέ]παισμον μοι εἰς τὴν πλευράν* as = *προσέπεσον*. May it not be a compound of *πρός* and *παίω* (cf. the use of *παίω* in P.S.I. 168. 15)? In 231. 7 *τοῖς* can hardly be the article; perhaps the end of *αὐ]τοῖς*? In l. 9 f. of the same *ὁ αὐτὸς ἐγκαλούμενος* not 'the same fellow, although he is being accused' but 'the same accused person'. 232. 1 qu. *τρ[ὶ] ἐπιδ[ε]δομένου*? In 339, receipt for part of a dowry received *παρὰ τῆς προούσις* (sic) *καὶ συνούσης γυναικός*, have we a case of a change of status in the relationship, e.g. from *ἀγραφος* to *ἐγγραφος γάμος*? In l. 4 of the introduction to 347 (c) for 'fifty-eight' read 'seventy-eight' if *ση* is right in the text.

Volume VI is more miscellaneous in its contents but has a unity, since all the documents edited are from the University of Michigan's excavations at Karanis. The ostraca, at the end, continue the series published by Amundsen

in 1935. They are of general interest only incidentally; the editing is, as usual from this source, excellent, but it is to be hoped that a commentary on them will soon follow; texts of this kind require such assistance more than most. A number of the papyri relate to taxation and, with the admirable commentaries, make a valuable contribution to the evidence for several branches of the fiscal system. Of the other documents, 364, an official letter on the transfer of catocic land, is an interesting example of a chancery hand as written not in the prefect's chancery but in the office of a tax-farmer. An extract from the minutes of the epistrategus, 365, concerns an Antinoite; the privileges of Antinoopolis are also illustrated by 426 (A.D. 199-200?), a petition: it is interesting that there the petitioner supports his case by alleging personal disability. It is clear from various pieces of evidence that at that period hard-pressed local authorities had a habit of disregarding privileges, however well established. In 365. 11, if the suggestion in the note is correct, it seems better to read *κατὰ <τὰ> κ.τ.λ.*; P. Oxy. 1119 is not really a parallel for the omission of *τά*. There are several declarations of unirrigated land and a census declaration (370) of A.D. 189. But the most interesting texts are the petitions, 421-6. I have already referred to the last. The petitioner's statement here about himself, *διὰ τὸ ὡς οὐ μόνον μονόφθαλμόν μ[ε] εἶναι [ἀλ]λά καὶ τῷ νομιζομένῳ ὑπάρχειν ἑτέρῳ ὀφθαλμῷ οὐ βλέπω, λευκώματος ἐκ τῆς κόρη[s] αὐτο[ῦ] διαφανέντος*, will interest medical historians. In 421 the petitioner

describes how he and the *archephephodos* of Karanis tracked thieves who had stolen two of his donkeys to Bacchias and were there arrested and maltreated by the local police. Jealousy between village authorities, suggest the editors. Perhaps; but the prisoners were released on the intervention of the village scribe and elders of Bacchias, and it seems as likely that, as the editors also suggest, the local police had an interest in the theft, from which they hoped to get a 'rake-off'. Still more interesting is 423-4, a case of trespass. The petitioner states that the trespassers went to his land *ἔχοντες βρέφος βουλόμενοι τὸν γεωργόν μου φθῶνῳ περικλῖσαι*. The editors suggest, with great plausibility, that this is a case of magic. They quote evidence for the use of a foetus or still-born child for magical purposes and, from Professor Bonner, for *φθόνος* as referring to black magic. The details are unfortunately obscure, but the statements that the culprits, when the petitioner went to the spot with the village officials, *προσ[έ]ρψάν μοι [τὸ] αὐτὸ βρέφος βουλόμενοι καὶ με φθόνῳ περικλῖσαι* and afterwards carried off the *βρέφος* go far to confirm the editors' view. If it be correct, this papyrus may be a *locus classicus* for magical practices in Roman Egypt.

Lastly, a reference may be made to an early use of *χρῆσθ* and the Christian cross (378, first half of 4th cent.). In 371. 2 may not *δια()* be *δια(φόρων)*, 'various items'? (Note the *καὶ ἄλλας δαπάνας* in l. 4.)

H. I. BELL.

London.

YALE CLASSICAL STUDIES

Yale Classical Studies. Volume VIII. Pp. 178; 2 plates. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1942. Cloth, 13s. 6d.

THE present volume comprises six articles on very different topics. C. W. Mendell on 'Lucan's Rivers' examines the post-Virgilian 'geographical fashion in poetry', without suggesting any general conclusions regarding the art of Lucan. A. O'Brien-Moore gives information on the choice of names by recipients of

Roman citizenship, who, it appears, by no means invariably adopted the names of the commanders who granted citizenship. His primary text is *CIL* iii. 399, which concerns M. Tullius Cratippus, the son or grandson of the philosopher who became a Roman through the influence of Cicero. A. R. Bellinger discusses the date and history of Hyspaosines, who in the second century B.C. ruled over the town of Charax at the head of the Persian Gulf. H. M. Hubbell

ident
a Ch
R. C
kind
toria
perso
the v
were
torie
its in
final
cal V
meter
formi
volum
occu
the h
andri
38 ta
analy

Philoi
Mi
(Un
um
pla
sou
THIS
have
misch
of wa
or five
Greek
L. J.
pages
A long
of tw
Folse
sertat
the G
of Mi
Crafts
and S
to be
poets
Metal
Textil
chapte
are to
House
City P
indust
reader

identifies P. 488 Yale as a fragment of a Christian ritual for morning worship. R. O. Fink, in '*Victoria Parthica* and kindred *Victoriae*', distinguishes the *Victoria Augusti*, which symbolized the personal prowess of the Emperor, from the various *Victoriae de gentibus*, which were personifications of historic victories, celebrated so long as each retained its importance in men's memory. The final article, 'The Localization of Metrical Word-Types in the Greek Hexameter' by E. G. O'Neill, is the most formidable piece of research in the volume. It examines the positions occupied by words of varying length in the hexameter from Homer to the Alexandrians; the results being set out in 38 tables of statistics based on the analysis of over 7,000 verses. The treat-

ment might well have been humanized, or at least illustrated, by introducing sample lines, even if the author had to compose some of them himself. Among his conclusions he points out that his labours give some support to 'a chori-zontic view' of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. But it also appears that in comparison with the similarities observed in the hexameters of all poets, the peculiarities of particular poets or particular periods are 'really insignificant'; there is no such thing as a specifically Homeric or a specifically Alexandrian type of hexameter. A supplement correlates the results with the much less thorough-going metrical researches of earlier scholars.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

MISSOURI STUDIES

Philological Studies in Honor of Walter Miller. Edited by R. P. Robinson. (University of Missouri Studies, Volume XI, number 3.) Pp. 190; 13 plates. Columbia: University of Missouri, 1936. \$1.25.

THIS number of *Missouri Studies* would have been noticed long ago but for a mischance and subsequent conditions of war-time. F. C. Murgotten, in four or five pages, collects references in Greek and Latin literature to the cicada. L. J. Richardson writes four or five pages on the clausula in prose and verse. A longer paper of doubtful profit is one of twenty-two pages by Miss M. E. Folse which is part of a doctoral dissertation submitted 'to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Missouri' and entitled 'Arts and Crafts in the Epics of Vergil, Lucan, and Statius'. It gives the information to be gleaned from the three Latin epic poets on Sculpture, Wood Carving, Metal Work, Jewels and Plate, Arms, Textiles, and Painting. The unpublished chapters of the dissertation deal, we are told, with Architecture, Temples, Houses and Palaces, Fortifications, and City Plans. The paper is the result of industry but is dull reading, and the reader may welcome the unconscious

humour of this sentence: 'when Statius compares Capaneus bearing off the dead body of a foe to Heracles bringing home the Erymanthian boar (*Theb.* viii, 746-750), vase paintings and metopes leap into the recollection, and one wonders which of many the poet had in mind.' The remaining six papers are of greater importance. T. A. Brady, on pp. 9-20, discusses 'The Gymnasium in Ptolemaic Egypt'. In view of A. Klotz's misrepresentation in *Phil. Woch.* 1938, 356 it may be said here that the author argues that inscriptions which read 'Ερμει 'Ηρακλει refer not to a 'Mischgottheit' but to two separate gods. On pp. 21-51 Miss M. Carpenter writes on 'Romanos and the Mystery Play of the East'. She gives the Greek text and an English translation of a Resurrection kontakion by Romanos and seeks to show that 'the kontakia of Romanos are important because they are a link between Syrian dramatic interests and those of Constantinople. They are important because they show how naturally apocryphal accounts of the life of Christ and the disciples grew; and they are important in revealing to what extent the choice of material for later church drama had already become fixed in the time of Romanos.' Miss H. M.

Johnson gives on pp. 75-93 a paper entitled 'Botanical References in Hemacandra' which is concerned with the identification of plants. She is preparing a botanical glossary to the works of Hemacandra and the present paper does not include food grains. Miss B. P. McCarthy writes on pp. 95-107 on 'The Form of Varro's Menippean Satires' and argues that there is no evidence that they included dramatic dialogues. On fr. 60 she might have recalled that Birt, *Rh. Mus.* lxxx, 1931, p. 244, well compares the words in the second column of the speech of the Emperor Claudius discovered at Lyons *tempus est iam, Ti. Caesar Germanice, detegere te patribus conscriptis, quo tendat oratio tua.* R. P. Robinson, in an interesting, lucid, and well-written paper on pp. 118-40, argues that the manuscript V of Ammianus Marcellinus is a copy of M of which six leaves survive at Cassel. The evi-

dence of stichometry seems to me to be inconclusive, and perhaps the other evidence does not amount to proof. Indeed the writer himself, though he feels his evidence is overwhelmingly in his favour, allows that 'perhaps Clark is correct in saying that in the nature of the evidence our problem is incapable of absolute solution'. Twelve plates reproduce all that remains of M. On the final paper H. A. Sanders gives a study, including collations, of manuscript no. 16 of the Michigan collection, a twelfth-century manuscript of the New Testament which is 876 in the last Gregory numbering.

The number, which begins with a portrait of Walter Miller and two pages on his career by J. R. Angell, ends with a page setting out his publications.

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

THE GOLDEN FLEECE

Robert GRAVES: *The Golden Fleece*. Pp. 371; 4 plates, genealogical table, 3 maps. London: Cassell, 1944. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

THIS novel is a serious attempt to portray the life of the Heroic Age. Mr. Graves has studied the ancient mythographers and the results of modern investigation with an omnivorous appetite and, it would seem, a good digestion. A generous measure of corroborative detail, most of it well authenticated, serves to lend verisimilitude to a narrative which few have found convincing. Mr. Graves does not shirk incredible marvels; he is ready to account persuasively for anything, in the story or out of it, by more varied and therefore more convincing methods than his fore-runners.

In his Introduction, which is valuable as demonstrating how the creative mind works in animating the dry bones of antiquity, he says that he adopts the view-point of a Greek of not later than the sack of Corinth in 146 B.C. This seems to me to create more difficulty than it obviates; e.g. would not the apparatus of civilization in the Bronze

Age be hidden from a Greek of the second century B.C. under the superstructure of classical times? Still more, would a second-century writer know, and, if so, would he tell, all that Mr. Graves narrates (and persuasively) about the conflict between the Mediterranean Earth Mother and the Achaean Sky Father, which underlies and motivates the story? Mr. Graves postulates that the failure of Apollonius Rhodius' first version was due to indiscretion in revealing much of this esoteric lore; would a writer of only a century later obtain a more tolerant hearing?

In the main Mr. Graves follows Apollonius, but he adds much from other mythographers and some of his own invention. He uses his sources very ingeniously: he is especially happy, as a poet should be, in transferring the memorable similes; one—that of the mad dog—he uses (p. 233) far better than Valerius Flaccus does (vii. 125-6); Apollonius' idyll of the goddesses, Eros and Ganymede, is charmingly converted into a ballad sung by Atalanta, when the Argonauts debate their Colchian strategy.

Mr. Graves's original devices vary

in v
story
Mede
mou
that
ing t
Adria
phali
from
Jason
the s
good
Other
in un
legen
befor
vice t
Aeete
grava

The
illustr
titled
Rhod
πόρτυ
and C
(sic) t
and t
Muse
bring
'Chei

Ivan M
Gorg
in Cl
314.
Press
Pape
ON the
from E
is really
water-c
'unseen
life: the
sieve) o
leaky ja
Such a
truly &
argues
of quot
have be
argumen
the alleg
with Pla
of it, is
Platonic
his view
the myt

in value. Some are a support to the story, notably his suggestion that Jason, Medea, and the Fleece left Argo at the mouth of the Danube and navigated that river and the Save by canoe, meeting the ship again at the head of the Adriatic; his identification of the Stymphalian Birds with the spring migrants from the south (p. 19); his diagnosis of Jason as expressed by Cheiron (p. 107); the stress he lays on the powers, for good or evil, of the ghosts of the slain. Others seem less happily useful: it is in unnecessary conflict with many other legends to make Hercules kill Cheiron before Argo sails; and though its service to his version is plain, the killing of Aetes by Atalanta seems a wanton aggravation of Argo's load of blood-guilt.

The maps are clear and good. The illustrations are rather arbitrarily entitled: the design on the jacket, a Rhodian plate, with a figure of the *πόρνια θηρῶν* type wearing Harpy wings and Gorgoneion, is described as Philara (*sic*) the mother of the Centaur Cheiron, and the B.F. vase-painting in the British Museum usually interpreted as Peleus bringing Achilles to Cheiron is labelled 'Cheiron and the Infant Jason'. There

are slips, some possibly of the printer's, e.g. Mosynoechians (p. 213), Hadrumeton (p. 331) or Hedrumetum (p. 337). I question why Henete and the Hene-tians (p. 206) have an aspirate; whether by 'painted Minyan pottery' (p. 211) is meant what is technically known as Minyan ware, which was but insignificantly painted, if at all; whether it is appropriate to introduce Mithras (p. 235), whose worship belongs to Imperial times; and, more frivolously, whether, if modern methods are to account for the miraculous powers of Aesculapius, the hint in Apollodorus III. x. 3 does not point to blood transfusion rather than artificial respiration.

Mr. Graves is superior to all earlier tellers of this story in that the individual gifts of all the Argonauts have scope and are serviceable. Their characterization is not so appealing. Hercules is the buffoon and glutton of the comic stage; the others are equally repellent. A novel reader attracted by the romance of the subject might well complain that among more than thirty prominent characters not one shows a single amiable touch of humanity.

J. R. BACON.

SHORT REVIEWS

Ivan M. LINFORTH: *Soul and Sieve in Plato's Gorgias*. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 12, No. 17.) Pp. 295-314. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1944. Paper, 25c.

ON the strength of *σῶμα σῆμα* and a quotation from Euripides Socrates suggests that our life is really death, and that therefore the myth of the water-carriers in 'Hades' really describes the 'unseen' activities of foolish souls in the present life: the endless labour of the higher 'part' (the sieve) of each soul to satisfy the lower 'part' (the leaky jar) which is the seat of the sensual appetites. Such a life—the life advocated by Calicles—is truly *δεινός*, a hell on earth. Professor Linforth argues convincingly that this particular mixture of quotation and allegorical interpretation could have been devised only for the purpose of the argument here presented in the *Gorgias*. Hence the allegorical interpretation is probably 'original with Plato himself'; the *τῶν σοφῶν τις* who thought of it, is not Empedocles or Philolaus but 'the Platonic Socrates', whose habit it is to attribute his views to fictitious authorities. The author of the myth (the *κομψὸς ἀνὴρ*) is a different person;

the statement that he *intended* the allegorical meaning is merely the conventional thing for the allegorical interpreter to say. Like most authors of an ancient and popular law or fable he is anonymous and unknown. L. offers an attractive explanation of the difficult *ἀμορτία*—and *λήθη*—of the disordered soul, as equivalent to the *δυσμάθεια* and *λήθη* mentioned as the disorders of the highest plane of the soul (*τὸ λογικόν*) in *Tim.* 87 a. Thus *ἀμορτία* means culpable 'lack of conviction', 'stubborn rejection of sound doctrine'. He also relieves us of two obstructive puns: the notion that *ἀμορτία* is a play on *πίθος*, and *ἀμύητος* on *μύω*, is due to the misplaced exuberance of commentators. L. perhaps interprets *σῶμα σῆμα* too rigidly in taking it to imply that the entombed soul is dead. Plato, I think, need not, and would not, have introduced it here if he had thought it 'an almost meaningless piece of eschatology' with no psychological implications. But this point does not touch the main contentions of this little piece of work, which was well worth doing and has been excellently done.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

Joseph FONTENROSE: *The Festival called Boegia at Didyma*. (University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology, Vol. 1, No. 11.) Pp. 291-304; 2 plates. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 1944. Paper, 25c.

THIS is a good, cautious, and ingenious handling of difficult and uncertain material. There is, or rather was, an inscription which Cockerell (1810-14) and Le Bas (in 1843-4) saw and copied. It was evidently hard to read when the former saw it, nearly illegible when the latter did his best with it. It deals with the festival called Boegia (neut. plur. in earlier documents, fem. sing. in later ones, including the inscription in question), and has attracted the attention of several scholars, including Professor Fontenrose.¹ In this article he restores and corrects the text in a very plausible manner, with the help of other relevant documents, mostly inscriptional, and comes to the following conclusions, of which the first is perhaps the most important for the history of ancient religion in general.

(1) The date is 17/16 B.C., in other words it is contemporary with Augustus' Secular Games, and so may be supposed to be part of his revival of 'the older, traditional religious forms'.

(2) The Boegia was an old festival, out of use for some time, probably because the position of Boegos involved considerable expense. It was in honour of Apollo and Zeus.

(3) The Boegos was a priest, it would seem of Zeus Hyetios and Soter, elected for one year. It is not clear in what sense he 'drove' the ox, which was no doubt a sacrificial victim.

(4) The festival included a contest, probably an athletic event of some kind.

Other details are obscure, though some reasonable suggestions are made concerning them. Altogether, the study has taken us a step nearer to a complete knowledge of the local Greek festivals.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

¹ Literature on p. 291, note 1 of the offprint.

Oscar BRONEER: *The Tent of Xerxes and the Greek Theater*. (University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology, Vol. 1, No. 12.) Pp. 305-12. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 1944. Paper, 25c.

DR. BRONEER asks us to believe:

(1) That the *κατασκευή* (Herod. ix. 70) which Xerxes left to Mardonius included his tent. [This is certainly not proved by the mere fact that it included *παρὰστράματα ποικίλα*.]

(2) That the supposed tent was sent to Athens for exhibition. [No evidence offered.]

(3) That it was used as the background in the performance of Phrynichus' *Phoenissae* in 475 B.C., when Themistocles was choregus, and (apparently) set up in the theatre of Dionysus, until thirty years later it served [there really is evidence of this] in some way as a model for the Odeum of Pericles. [Such evidence as there is of scenic backgrounds at this period suggests extreme simplicity—nothing like the magnificent erection conceived by Dr. Broneer. The *στέγος ἀρχαίων* in

Aeschylus' *Persae* seems to have been a very poor affair by comparison.]

(4) That, in speaking of the Odeum as a *κατασκευάσμα*, Pausanias (I. 19. 4) was recalling Herodotus' use of *κατασκευή* (including the tent).

(5) That 'the word *σκηνή*, which for some reason came to be attached to the king's pavilion, became popular because of the great stir created by the tent captured at Plataea'. [What great stir?] 'It seems more than a coincidence that the word *σκηνή*, which at first may have had an exotic and specifically Persian connotation' [or equally, may not have had] 'became the name of the structure in the theater that was in the process of taking shape at the time when Xerxes' tent had fired the imagination of the Greeks. Is the reason to be found in the *unrecorded fact*' [quite so! Italics mine] 'that the king's tent was brought to Athens and used or imitated in the theater for the first time at the performance of Phrynichus' *Phoenician Women*, and thus formed the prototype for the permanent skene?' [There is really no reason to suppose that dramatic backgrounds were like Xerxes' tent—though of course we do not know what Xerxes' tent was like. It is not proved by the fact that both were called *σκηνή*—a word of very various meanings.]

(6) That the permanent scene-building 'with its tower-like wings, *παρασκήνια*' [were they tower-like? Of what period is he thinking?] was an imitation of Persian palace architecture, and that this all came about because the first skené imitated (or was) the tent of Xerxes, which in its turn copied the architecture of the contemporary palace at Susa'. [This seems to be pure imagination.]

Quibus qui falli potest, debet. The eight pages of this article contain many more doubtful statements, but perhaps enough has been said to make the reader cautious.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

R. WALZER: *Galen on Medical Experience*. First edition of the Arabic version with English translation and notes. Pp. xi+164. London: Oxford University Press for the Wellcome Trustees, 1944. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

Περὶ τῆς ἱατρικῆς ἐμπειρίας was intended as an introduction to one of Galen's earliest works, *Περὶ τῆς ἀρίστης αἰδέσεως* (the extant text of which is probably spurious). It presents the arguments of the dogmatist and empiricist schools of medicine in the form of two lengthy speeches. Being based on a debate that actually took place, and written in reply to Asclepiades' attacks on empiricism, it leads us into the middle of the great discussion that shaped ancient medical theory. Above all, it preserves in précis form the main arguments of the once vast and now irrevocably lost empiricist literature.

The Arabic version of this work is all that exists of it, apart from two short Greek fragments, which by themselves gave an entirely wrong impression of its character. It was made some time after A.D. 863 from a Syriac translation at least thirteen years earlier. The double translation, into languages so widely different in structure, has caused the style to be somewhat diffuse, but a comparison with the Greek of the fragments shows that the sense

and to well re

The illegible the ski of the similar tunate ting pe is guar H. A. happy passage of this remind away i

Oxfo

Catalog theca

(Ex skrift

tions THE co

catalog citizens

size of for the

Gothen this mo

Greek a years h

MSS., w other w

Greek a of one

matter, authors

—Ps.-C

egetes Sallust,

Virgil. represen

of Joam Haliebu

Historia Ricardu

a tracta Five an

contain The

every t Kleberg

sity of Schol

ström d tion of

was thu Univ

David Glam

photo Natio

Paper THESE

and tone of the original have been remarkably well reproduced.

The edition, based as it is on a single, rather illegible MS. of A.D. 1064, gives further proof of the skill which Dr. Walzer exhibited in his edition of the Arabic of *Περὶ τῶν ἐνταφισμένων βρεφῶν* and similar texts. The translation is precise, and fortunately does not attempt to gloss over the irritating peculiarities of the Arabic style. Its accuracy is guaranteed by the collaboration of Professor H. A. R. Gibb, who has also contributed many happy emendations. A collection of Greek parallel passages is given in the Appendix. The publication of this sumptuously produced volume is a timely reminder of the many Greek works still hidden away in unedited Arabic translations.

C. RABIN.

Oxford.

Catalogus Codicum Graecorum et Latinorum Bibliothecae Gotoburgensis. Digessit Tönnes KLEBERG. (Ex Göteborgs Stadsbibliotek 1891-1941 Minneskrift seorsum expressum.) Pp. 48; 6 illustrations. Gothenburg: 1941. Paper.

THE collection of Greek and Latin MSS. here catalogued is of recent formation. In 1907 five citizens of Gothenburg (then a town about the size of present-day Dundee) subscribed Kr. 6500 for the purchase of Greek and Latin MSS. for the Gothenburg Library (*o felix Gotoburgum!*), and with this money Professor V. Lundström bought two Greek and twenty Latin MSS. in Munich. In later years he himself presented two Greek and six Latin MSS., while four other Latin MSS. were acquired in other ways. The collection thus now contains four Greek and thirty Latin MSS. With the exception of one of s. x/xi containing a *lunare* and similar matter, all are of late date (s. xii-xvii). The classical authors included are—besides Aristotle in Latin—Ps.-Cato, Ps.-Cicero, Columella, Dionysius Periegetes (with Eustathius' commentary), Justin, Sallust, Seneca, Statius, Terence, Vegetius, and Virgil. In the medieval literature Scotland is represented by the opening pages of the *De Sphaera* of Joannes de Sacro Bosco (John of Holywood or Haliebus) and Michael Scott's version of the *Historia Animalium*, England by the *Anatomia* of Ricardus Anglicus (Richard of Wendover?), and a tractate on poverty by Ricardus de Conyngton. Five anecdotes are included in a Greek MS. of s. xii containing the lives of thirty-odd female saints.

The proof of a catalogue is in the using, but every test I can apply indicates strongly that Hr. Kleberg's catalogue is as exemplary as the generosity of the donors of the MSS. catalogued.

Scholars will regret to learn that Professor Lundström died in 1940. The same year saw the publication of Fasc. 4 of his edition of Columella, which was thus unhappily left incomplete.

W. L. LORIMER.

University of St. Andrews.

David Moore ROBINSON: *The Great Glory and Glamour of the Dodecanese*. Pp. 30; 20 half-tone photographs in text. New York: Dodecanesian National Council (30 Rockefeller Plaza), 1944. Paper.

THESE thirty glamorous pages contain biographi-

cal notes on David Moore Robinson, occasional glimpses of his travels, and a rambling account of the islands with some good photographs not well printed. Those of the Greek houses excavated at Camirus, of the Hellenistic fountain-house at Ialysus, of the volcanic crater of Nisyros, and of a fine athlete head in the Robinson Collection at Baltimore are noteworthy.

JOHN L. MYRES.

Oxford.

A. E. GORDON: *A Mysterious Latin Inscription in California*. (University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology, Vol. I, No. 13.) Pp. 313-56; 2 plates. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 1944. Paper, 50 c.

THE metrical inscription of five lines, which occupies the forty-odd pages of this book, is published by Professor Gordon from a rubbing in the collection of the University of California. The original is probably in the Vatican. Originally published by Donati in 1765-75, it seems to have been lost to sight till the California rubbing was made in 1902.

The subject is trivial enough—the death of a child at the age of eleven months. But the inscription simply bristles with peculiarities. The child's name seems to be 'Homobonus Athenodorus', the two parts separated by nearly four lines. The name of the mother, Anymone, is very rare. 'Roma domo' at the end is an unusual inversion. The orthography is very odd—*infas* for *infans*, *adque* for *atque*, *ē* for *et*. The diction has a curious flavour, certainly suggestive of Christianity: 'here he rests, his soul delivered to the Higher Powers, he who in the eleventh month gave back the light he had received'. Yet the date, conjectured by the editor on grounds of epigraphy ('perhaps about A.D. 200'), is early for a Christian inscription, and the formula, 'natus Quirina', is quite unparalleled in one. Professor Gordon devotes some interesting pages to a close study of the curious phrases of the inscription. They are certainly outside normal pagan usage; but they might be appropriate to members of some religious philosophy of the East or even to secret Christians, believers who, for self-protection, hid their faith under vague and ambiguous forms.

There is, then, no dearth of interest in these few halting lines, and Professor Gordon has devoted to them that kind of intensive study that can sometimes make one small particular object a pattern for much subsequent research. But the doubt lingers in the mind whether the author should not have waited to decide, by inquiry at the Vatican, questions which he has had to leave undetermined, the question of date, for instance, and the question of authenticity. An inscription that is so peculiar everywhere seems almost too good to be true. An English reviewer can hardly repress a sigh over the expense of so much paper on so small a subject; but this is probably a mere outbreak of envy.

HAROLD MATTINGLY.

British Museum.

R. W. LEE: *The Elements of Roman Law* with a translation of the Institutes of Justinian. Pp. xxiii+488. London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1944. Cloth, 27s. 6d. net.

TEACHERS of Roman Law will agree with Dr. Lee that there is a need for a handbook of Roman Law for those law students, unfortunately now the great majority, whose knowledge of Latin is insufficient to read the texts. His book combines a systematic exposition with a translation of Justinian's *Institutes*. It also contains some references to Modern Law, intended, as he says, 'to direct attention to some features in the landscape'.

Of the translation it need only be said that it is admirable for its purpose. To some extent, however, it disproves the assumption that it is possible to learn Roman Law with no knowledge of Latin. It avoids the perilous course of giving without explanation equivalents of Latin terms drawn from English Law and uses more or less uniformly either non-technical English translations, with the Latin terms added in brackets, or the Latin terms themselves untranslated. Care has been taken either to explain these terms in the commentary or to translate them in the short vocabulary given on pp. 475-7, but examples of terms not so dealt with occur occasionally, e.g. *inter praesentes* and *inter absentes* in *Inst.* ii. 6 *pr.* (p. 123), which is paraphrased in § 164 of the commentary (p. 121), but without cross reference. There is, however, some inconsistency in the use of Latin in the commentary. *Jus gentium*, for example, is said in § 46 and note 80 (p. 32) to be translated as 'Universal Law', but it appears *passim* thereafter untranslated (e.g. § 59 (1), p. 45, and in the translation of *Inst.* i. 3. 4 on p. 54). Occasionally Latin sentences appear untranslated, as in § 576 (c) (p. 367), though they are more usually accompanied by a translation (e.g. § 389, p. 276; § 583, p. 371; § 604, p. 386, and the numerous translations of formulae on pp. 434-6). Occasionally different translations for the same phrases are given, as in § 598 and § 644.

On the other hand, passages are often quoted in the commentary in English without Latin. There appears to be no particular method in selecting which course to follow.

The quality of the commentary is such as is to be expected from a civilian of Dr. Lee's reputation and a teacher of his experience. It is remarkably comprehensive for its bulk, while avoiding the crabbedness which often follows compression. As a primary text-book the commentary avoids, so far as is possible, controversial discussions, but references to modern authorities give the student access to such matters. Elementary students may, however, find some difficulty in the rather cursory discussion which some topics necessarily receive. For example, the reason why ownership in general is not discussed in the *Institutes* is rather enigmatically hinted at in § 139, and the non-Roman nature of the separation of the law relating to things into Dr. Lee's three heads of Law of Property, Law of Succession, and Law of Obligations, although explained in § 131, should, perhaps, be more stressed. Particularly good from the point of view of teaching is the treatment of the law of actions; it is unfortunate that the order of the *Institutes* relegates this to the end of the book.

The proof reading is throughout excellent. The only error noted is on p. 89 (§ 126): *Maiores viginti quinque anis-adolescentes*' (sic). Incidentally, on p. 117 (§ 158) there appears *minores XXV annis*. The student ignorant of any Latin might be confused by such variation. The first sentence of § 78. 2 (p. 58) also appears to require recasting. The illustrations from Modern Law include, besides references to English and Continental Law, references to South African Law, as might be expected from Dr. Lee's interests, but only somewhat scanty references to the Law of Scotland, which would have provided Dr. Lee in some instances with illustrations nearer to his hand.

J. S. MUIRHEAD.

University of Glasgow.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XL. 1: JANUARY, 1945

W. L. Westermann, *Slave Maintenance and Slave Revolts*: discusses evidence from contracts and other sources for arrangements, and accepted standards, for maintenance of slaves. R. J. Bonner and Gertrude Smith, *Administration of Justice in Boeotia*: collects the meagre evidence from Hesiodic to Roman times. L. W. Jones, *The Style and Vocabulary of Cassiodorus' Institutiones*: notes on eleven technical terms. C. A. Forbes, *Expanded Uses of the Greek Gymnasium*: discusses the use of gymnasia for teaching, for military training, and for public meetings. E. L. Highbarger, *Notes on Vergil's Bucolics*: notes on (1) the choice of the name Damon, (2) the 'development' of Tityrus, (3) the complexion of Menalcas as confirming identification with Virgil. P. C. Wilson interprets *Iliad* i. 116 in relation to the context.

XL. 2: APRIL, 1945

J. A. O. Larsen, *Representation and Democracy in Hellenistic Federalism*: examines the conditions of federal government of the four Macedonian republics and of the Lycian League, with particular reference to representation, and their bearing on the Achaean League; an appendix discusses the dating of *Tit. As. Min.* ii. 508. L. B. Lawler and A. E. Kober, *The 'Thracian Pig-Dance'*: attempt to explain the *κολαβρισμός* of Athen. 14. 629 d by reference to art and ritual. E. L. Bassett, *The Genitive Absolute in Latin*: claims that the gen. abs. is a native construction in Latin, adducing *Lucan* 8. 158 *stantis fati*, *Livy* 30. 26. 7 *exactae aetatis*, *Tac. Ann.* 14. 22 *discumbentis Neronis*. F. Solmsen, *Comanus 'of the First Friends'*: identifies the Alexandrian politician C., the courtier of Philometor, with the grammarian, the adversary of Aristarchus. R. Lattimore explains the situation implied in *Pind. Nem.* 7. 70-4.

TRANSACTIONS OF THE AMERICAN
PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

LXXIV: 1943

M. B. Ogle, *Romantic Movements in Antiquity*: on the growth of individualism and its romantic adjuncts in the Hellenistic Age and the last centuries of the Roman Empire. N. W. DeWitt, *Epicurus: All Sensations are True*: argues that this statement did not mean that all sensations are trustworthy. E. M. Sanford, *The Verbum Abbreviatum of Petrus Cantor*: quotations from Latin literature in a twelfth-century ecclesiastical handbook. M. Tait, *The Tragic Philosophy of the Iliad*: the *Iliad* represents man's conflict with death symbolized by the gods. L. B. Lawler, *Ὀρχήστρις Ἰωνική*: on the original character and development of this dance. J. P. Pritchard, *Aristotle, Horace, and Wordsworth*: on W.'s direct and indirect acquaintance with the poetic principles of A. and H. D. H. Abel, *Genealogies of Ethical Concepts from Hesiod to Bacchylides*: on personifications of virtues and vices and their imagined family-relationships. A. Segre, *A Note on the Classes of Roman Officials in the Age of Diocletian*: on the status of *ducenarii* and *centenarii* before and after the reforms of c. A.D. 297. E. A. Robinson, *Did Cicero complete the De Legibus?*: it was completed except for a proem which was omitted because of a decision (made perhaps in the middle of 43 B.C.) not to publish the work. S. Wilcox, *Criticisms of Isocrates and his φιλοσοφία*: on I.'s answers to the popular dislike of rhetoric, particularly forensic rhetoric, and to the common slander that he taught skill in petty litigation or sycophancy. K. von Fritz, *Sallust and the Attitude of the Roman Nobility at the time of the Wars against Jugurtha*: re-examines, with reference to the *Bellum Iugurthinum*, the objective basis for Sallust's polemics against the Roman aristocracy. P. De Lacy, *The Philosophy of the Aetna*: the poem is Epicurean, not Stoic, because it accepts the Epicurean criterion of truth (perception). P. Merlan, *Plotinus Enneads 2. 2*: this passage shows Plotinus' use of the Peripatetics, especially Alexander of Aphrodisias. W. H. Alexander, *Nullus Argento Color* (Horace, *Odes* 2. 2. 1-4): argues that Bentley erred in making the *nisi* clause the protasis of *inimice laminae*. V. B. Schuman, *The Greek Signatures of P. Mich. Inv. 4703*: seeks to decipher these names. W. C. McDermott, *Elissa*: this may be meant by Virgil as Aeneas' pet-name for Dido. J. L. Heller, *Nenia 'παλύνων'*: many citations suggest that *nenia* originally meant not 'dirge' but 'plaything'. E. A. Hahn, *Voice of Non-Finite Verb Forms in Latin and English*: parallels from Hittite suggest that the gerund and gerundive were originally voiceless.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

LXV. 4: OCTOBER, 1944

A. W. Gomme, *Athenian Notes*: maintains that inevitable confusion results from reading Isocretan ideas of Medism and Panhellenism into the movements of 510-483 B.C., that the 'Friends of the

Tyrants' were never organized as a third political party, and that the terms of the treaty of Callias are a problem of purely literary history, the solution of which is to be sought in a study of *Panegyricus*, 120. S. M. Pitcher, *Epic as I Here Define It*: retains *ἐποποιία* in *Poetics*, 1447^a 28, and understands it as a comprehensive term including all types of composition without musical accompaniment. L. Spitzer, *The Name of the Holy Grail*: suggests an ultimate derivation from Latin *cratis* and an original meaning of 'woven basket'. F. Mezger, *Latin Dii Indigites, Dii Novensides, and the Designation of IE kinship*: holds that *Indigites* and *Novensides* are antonyms meaning 'belonging to' and 'external to' the group. Y. Malkiel, *The Latin Base of the Spanish Suffix -eño*: listing a number of Latin adjectives in *-ineus*, suggests that these forms provide an origin for the suffix in question. R. M. Haywood, *On the Unity of the Miles Gloriosus*: supporting the conclusion by a discussion of relevant passages, decides that there is no *contaminatio* in the play. G. R. Morrow, *A Note on the Nichomachean Ethics*: refuses to accept the meaning 'personal' for the conjectural *ἰδιον* (in place of *ἰδεῖν*) in 1142^b 19.

LXVI. 1: JANUARY, 1945

G. B. A. Fletcher, *Notes on Tacitus*: gives, with illustrative parallels, a list of words, phrases, and constructions for which Tacitus has erroneously been accepted as the sole, or earliest prose, authority. F. W. Lenz, *The Monkeys of Archilochus*: insisting on the value of the *scholia*, despite their corrupt state, explains the reference in Aristides ii. 397, 3 ff. as an allusion to the fable of how the monkey tricked both elephant and lion when they were rivals for the throne. C. Pharr, *The Theodosian Code*, 6, 4, 21: dealing with the first sixteen lines of *Par. Lat.* 9643 offers a restored text with translation and commentary concerned especially with the *Temonarii* and their duties. A. K. Michels, *The Golden Bough of Plato*: holds that Meleager's description of Plato's *χρῦσειος κλών* suggested the Virgilian concept, which was designed to lead the reader's mind back to the Myth of Er. P. Maas, *Did Menander Nod? Epitrepontes* 53 (94 k): adds a further argument for attributing the words *ἐδέου, Σύρισκε*; to Davus instead of to the Judge.

LXVI. 2: APRIL, 1945

V. Ehrenberg, *Pericles and His Colleagues between 441 and 429 B.C.*: deals with (1) the evidence for and against the election of eleven Strategoi in any one year, and (2) the careers of Phormion and Hagnon in relation to election *ἐξ ἀπάντων*. C. Pharr, *A Thirteenth Century Formula of Anathema*: discusses the general form for such excommunication ritual, and argues that (1) the letter H has no reference to any particular individual, but should probably be emended to N (= *nomen*), (2) the Psalm prescribed is mentioned in other early English manuscripts. C. H. V. Sutherland, *Aerarium and Fiscus during the Early Empire*: concludes that Imperial control of the *aerarium* grew steadily more open, and the *fiscus*, through its

lavish subsidies, came to handle most of the public revenue and expenditure. S. Wilcox, *Isocrates' Fellow Rhetoricians*: denies that Isocrates ever accused his rivals of being logographers and teaching sycophancy, since by their 'forensic writings' he meant simply compositions in the plain style. J. A. Scott, *Homer and Hector*: defends his previous statement that only Paris and Hector figured in the *Cypria*, and illustrates the power of the poet's imagination. D. Macnaughton, *Note on the*

Alexandrian Calendar: holds that this calendar was established not earlier than 9 B.C. P. A. Clement, *Moralia*, 614E: places the *lacuna* between *καταχευμένη* and *ἀλλὰ γέλωτα*, and suggests *τὴν γέρανον ἡστίασεν οὐ μόνον ἀνιροῦσαν* to fill it. K. von Fritz, *ΓΕΡΟΥΣΙΑ-ΓΕΡΟΥΧΙΑ*: believes that this rare form should not be explained as meaning the assembly of the *γέρας ἔχοντες*, but merely reflects contemporary Spartan pronunciation, as in Ar. *Lys.* 980.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included unless they are also published separately.

- Alexander* (W. H.) Seneca's Dialogues I, II, VII, VIII, IX, X. The text emended and explained. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 13, No. 3.) Pp. 49-92. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1945. Paper, 50c.
- Bardon* (H.) L'Art de la Composition chez Catulle. (Publications de l'Université de Poitiers, Série 'Sciences de l'Homme', III.) Pp. 77. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1943. Paper, 30 fr.
- Bodenstedt* (M. I.) The Vita Christi of Ludolphus the Carthusian. (Catholic University of America Studies in Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Language and Literature, Vol. XVI.) Pp. viii + 160. Washington: Catholic University of America, 1944. Paper, \$2.
- Bowra* (C. M.) From Virgil to Milton. Pp. 248. London: Macmillan, 1945. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Brown* (R. A.) S. Aureli Augustini De Beata Vita. A translation with an introduction and commentary. (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. LXXII.) Pp. xvii + 193. Washington: Catholic University of America, 1944. Paper.
- Campbell* (A. Y.) Q. Horati carmina cum epodis edidit emendavit adnotavit A. Y. C. Liverpool: University Press (London: Hodder and Stoughton), 1945. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Catin* (L.) En lisant Tite-Live. Pp. 205. (Collection Budé.) Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1944. Paper, 40 fr.
- Cherniss* (H.) Aristotle's Criticism of Plato and the Academy. Vol. I. Pp. xxvi + 610. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1944. Cloth, 33s. 6d. net.
- Cherniss* (H.) The Riddle of the Early Academy. Pp. 103. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1945. Cloth, \$1.50.
- Clift* (E. H.) Latin Pseudepigrapha. A Study in Literary Attributions. Pp. 158. Baltimore: privately printed (J. H. Furst Co.), 1945. Cloth.
- Dawson* (C. M.) Romano-Campanian Mythological Landscape Painting. (Yale Classical Studies, Vol. IX.) Pp. xvi + 233; 25 plates. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1944. Cloth, 20s. net.
- Deman* (T.) Le Témoignage d'Aristote sur Socrate. (Collection d'Études Anciennes.) Pp. 138. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1942. Paper, 40 fr.
- d'Hérouville* (P.) Géorgiques I-II: Champs, Vergers, Forêts. Pp. 153. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1942. Paper, 9 fr.
- d'Hérouville* (P.) L'Astronomie de Virgile. Pp. viii + 32. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1940. Paper, 30 fr.
- Diès* (A.) Platon: Philèbe. Pp. cxiii + 94. (Collection Budé.) Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1941. Paper, 40 fr.
- Excavations at Dura-Europos*. Preliminary Report of the Ninth Season, 1935-36. Edited by M. I. Rostovtzeff, A. R. Bellinger, F. E. Brown and C. B. Welles. Part I: The Agora and Bazaar. Pp. xiv + 270; 30 plates, 98 figures. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1944. Cloth and boards, 33s. 6d. net.
- Excidium Troiae*. Edited by E. B. Atwood and V. K. Whittaker. Pp. cxi + 81. Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1944. Cloth, \$3.50.
- Feyel* (M.) Contribution à l'Épigraphie Béotienne. Pp. 170; 6 plates. (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, fasc. 95.) Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1942. Paper, 70 fr.
- Fontenrose* (J.) Philemon, Lot and Lycaon. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 13, No. 4.) Pp. 93-120. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1945. Paper, 25c.
- Fränkel* (H.) Ovid: a Poet between Two Worlds. (Sather Classical Lectures, XVIII.) Pp. ix + 282. Berkeley: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1945. Cloth, \$2.50.
- Friedländer* (P.) Documents of Dying Paganism. Textiles of Late Antiquity in Washington, New York and Leningrad. Pp. 66; frontispiece and 16 plates. Berkeley: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1945. Cloth, \$1.50.
- Gallagher* (J.) Caesar: De Bello Gallico I (1-29). Edited with Notes and Vocabulary. Pp. xlv + 197. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1945. Boards, 2s. 3d.
- Gallagher* (J.) Horace: Odes II. Edited with notes and vocabulary. Pp. xxvii + 191. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1945. Boards, 2s. 3d.
- Glover* (T. R.) Springs of Hellas and other Essays. With a memoir by S. C. Roberts. Pp. xv + 210; portrait. Cambridge: University Press, 1945. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

- Godel (R.)* Recherche d'une foi. (Collection d'Études Anciennes.) Pp. 159. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1940. Paper, 25 fr.
- Grimal (P.)* Frontin: Les Aqueeducs de la Ville de Rome. Texte établi, traduit et commenté. (Collection Budé.) Pp. xxiii+114: map. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1944. Paper, 35 fr.
- Hachforth (R.)* Plato's Examination of Pleasure. A translation of the *Philebus* with introduction and commentary. Pp. vii+144. Cambridge: University Press, 1945. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Haight (E. H.)* More Essays on Greek Romances. Pp. xi+215. New York: Longmans, 1945. Cloth, \$2.50.
- Herescu (N. I.)* Bibliographie de la Littérature Latine. Pp. xviii+426. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1943. Paper, 250 fr.
- Hesperia*. Volume XIV: Number 2. April-June, 1945. The American Excavations in the Agora: Twenty-sixth Report. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1945.
- Jaeger (W.)* Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture. Volume III. Translated from the German manuscript by G. Highet. Pp. viii+374. Oxford: Blackwell. Cloth, 22s. 6d. net.
- Knight (W. F. J.)* A Virgilian Sociology. A paper read to the Annual General Meeting of the Classical Association at St. Albans, 1944. (From Comparative Literature Studies.) Pp. 9-17. Cardiff: Priory Press, 1944. Paper, 1s. 6d.
- Lavarenne (M.)* Prudence. Tome I: Cathe-merinon Liber. (Collection Budé.) Pp. xxxix+78. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1943. Paper, 45 fr.
- Lettres d'Humanité*. Tome I: 1942. Pp. 220. Tome II: 1943. Pp. 213. Tome III: 1944. Pp. 169. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. Paper.
- Malkiel (Y.)* Development of the Latin Suffixes -antia and -entia in the Romance Languages, with special regard to Ibero-Romance. (University of California Publications in Linguistics, Vol. I, No. 4.) Pp. vi+41-188. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1945. Paper, \$1.50.
- Malkiel (Y.)* The Derivation of Hispanic *fealdad(e)*, *fielddad(e)*, and *frialddad(e)*. (University of California Publications in Linguistics, Vol. I, No. 5.) Pp. 189-214. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1945. Paper, 25c.
- Mathieu (G.)* Isocrate: Discours. Tome III: Sur la Paix—Aréopagitique—Sur l'Échange. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection Budé.) Pp. 182. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1942. Paper, 60 fr.
- Mémorial des Études Latines* offert à J. Marouzeau. Pp. 688. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1943. Paper, 300 fr.
- Rattenbury (R. M.)* and *Lumb (T. W.)* Héliodore: Les Éthiopiennes. Tome III. (Collection Budé.) Pp. ix+127. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1943. Paper, 80 fr.
- Richter (G. M. A.)* Archaic Attic Gravestones. (Martin Classical Lectures, Vol. X.) Pp. xvi+160; 108 figures. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (for Oberlin College and the Metropolitan Museum of Art), 1944. Cloth, \$2.50.
- Robertson (D. S.)* Apulée: Les Métamorphoses. Texte établi par D. S. R. et traduit par P. Vallette. Tome I (livres I-III): pp. 64+85. Tome II (livres IV-VI): pp. 101. (Collection Budé.) Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1940. Paper, 30 fr. each.
- Soury (G.)* Aperçus de Philosophie Religieuse chez Maxime de Tyr. (Collection d'Études Anciennes.) Pp. 78. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1942. Paper, 40 fr.
- Soury (G.)* La Démonologie de Plutarque. (Collection d'Études Anciennes.) Pp. 242. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1942. Paper, 100 fr.
- Tierney (J.)* Horace: Epodes. Edited with notes and vocabulary. Pp. xxi+137. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1945. Boards, 2s. 3d.
- Tierney (J.)* Livy: Book XXVI. Edited with Notes and Vocabulary. Pp. xlviii+246. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1945. Boards, 2s. 3d.
- Τριπύδης (K. A.)* 'H' Ἀλεξανδρινὴ Πολίσις. Τόμος Α'. Pp. 235. Athens: M. Garuphalis, 1943. Paper.
- Turyn (A.)* The Manuscripts of Sophocles (From *Traditio*, Vol. II.) Pp. 41. New York: Cosmopolitan Science and Art Service Co., 1944. Paper.
- van Otterlo (W. A. A.)* Untersuchungen über Begriff, Anwendung und Entstehung der Griechischen Ringkomposition. (Mededeelingen der Ned. Akad. van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, N.R. 7.3.) Pp. 46. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1944. Paper, fl. 1.20.
- Waltz (P.)* Anthologie Grecque. Anthologie Palatine. Texte et traduction. Tome V (Livre VII, 364-748). Pp. 187. Tome VI (Livre VIII). Pp. 123. (Collection Budé.) Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1941, 1944. Paper, 75, 120 fr.
- Weiss (H.)* Kausalität und Zufall in der Philosophie des Aristoteles. Pp. 193. Basel: Haus zum Falken, 1942. Paper, 10 Swiss fr.
- West (L. C.)* and *Johnson (A. C.)* Currency in Roman and Byzantine Egypt. (Princeton University Studies in Papyrology, No. 5.) Pp. ix+195. Princeton: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1944. Cloth, 20s. net.
- Wilkinson (L. P.)* Horace and his Lyric Poetry. Pp. ix+185. Cambridge University Press, 1945. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

INDEX

I. GENERAL INDEX

- American Journal of Philology* summarized (LXV 1, 2), 30; (LXV 4, LXVI 1, 2), 83
- Amyx's *Corinthian Vases in the Hearst Collection at San Simeon*, 29
- Apollo the Wolf-God, 8
- Aristophanes and Euripides, 37
- Arrowsmith's *Latin Verse through the Ages*, 26
- Atlantis Duri*, 11
- Austin (R. G.) on Knight's *Roman Vergil*, 16; Quintilian xii 2 28 and 31: 42 f.
- Axelsson's *Neue Senecastudien*, 66
- Bacon (J. R.) on Graves's *The Golden Fleece*, 78
- bad bronze, 52
- Balogh's *Political Refugees in Ancient Greece*, 23
- Beazley (J. D.) The Empress's joke (Procop. *Hist. arc.* xv 25-35), 12; on Amyx's *Corinthian Vases in the Hearst Collection at San Simeon*, 29; on Richter's *Kouroi*, 71
- Bell (H. I.) on Taubenschlag's *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri*, 25; on *Michigan Papyri* (V, VI), 74
- Boak's *A History of Rome to 565 A.D.* (3rd edition), 70
- Boegia, 80
- BOOKS RECEIVED, 31, 84
- Broneer's *The Tent of Xerxes and the Greek Theater*, 80
- Budé texts: *Pervigilium Veneris*, 65; Plato, *Philebus*, 57
- Bury (R. G.) Two notes on Plotinus, 53
- Campbell (A. Y.) Corrigenda to C.R. LVIII 9-11: 11
- Cavallin's *Studien zu den Briefen des Hl. Basilii*, 63
- certo* with the infinitive, 68
- Charlesworth (M. P.) on Balogh's *Political Refugees in Ancient Greece*, 23
- Classical Association, meeting of, 33
- Classical Philology summarized (XXXIX 3, 4), 30; (XL 1), 82; (XL 2), 84
- Clementi (C.) on Schilling's *La Veillée de Vénus*, 65
- Colman (D. S.) on some school books, 26
- Crutwell (R. W.) *Virgil Aen.* iv 247: 11
- Davidson and Thompson's *Small Objects from the Pnyx* (I), 28
- de Jonge's *Sprachlicher und historischer Kommentar zu Ammianus Marcellinus* xiv 7-11: 67
- Diès's *Platon, Philèbe*, 57
- Diodorus and Polybius, 39 ff.
- Dodds (E. R.) *Marcus Antoninus* vi 13: 53
- Dunbabin (R. L.) *Juvenal* iii 297-9: 11
- Edelstein's *The Hippocratic Oath*, 14
- Eichelholz (D. E.) *Bad Bronze* again, 52
- Eliot's *What is a Classic?*, 64
- Essays by Divers Hands*, 29
- Evans (E.) on Plumpe's *Mater Ecclesia*, 27
- Farquharson's *The Meditations of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus*, 60
- Fletcher (G. B. A.) Some certain or possible examples of literary reminiscence in Tacitus, 45 ff.; on Axelsson's *Neue Senecastudien*, 66; on de Jonge's *Sprachlicher und historischer Kommentar zu Ammianus Marcellinus* xiv 7-11: 67; on *Philological Studies in Honor of Walter Miller*, 77
- Fontenrose's *The Festival called Boegia at Didyma*, 80
- Forbes (P. B. R.) on Cavallin's *Studien zu den Briefen des Hl. Basilii*, 63
- Giles (A. F.) on Boak's *A History of Rome to 565 A.D.* (3rd edition), 70
- Gomme (A. W.) on Prakken's *Studies in Greek Genealogical Chronology*, 69
- Gordon's *A Mysterious Latin Inscription in California*, 81
- Gothenburg Library, classical MSS. in, 80
- Gow (A. S. F.) *Δάριος, Λάδιος, Φρύγιος* (Theocr. Ep. 18), 5; [Theocr.] *Id.* xxxiii 53 f.: 53
- Graves's *The Golden Fleece*, 78
- Greene's *Moirai*, 12 f.
- Griffith (J. G.) *Horace Odes* i 28 7-9: 45
- Hackforth (R.) The *ἀνεξέταστος βίος* in Plato, i ff.; on Diès's *Platon, Philèbe*, 57
- Hamilton (W.) on Minar's *Early Pythagorean Politics*, 56
- Hellenic and Roman Societies, meeting of, 33
- Henry's *Études Plotiniennes* (II), 59
- Hermathena* summarized (LXIII, LXIV), 29-30
- herniosus*, 12
- Hesperia*, Supplement VII: 28
- Hippocratic Oath, 14
- hirnea* 12
- Husselman, Boak, and Edgerton's *Papyri from Tebtunis*, pt. II: 74
- Jaeger's *Paideia* (II), 54
- Jenkins (C.) on Laistner and King's *A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts*, 20; on Henry's *Études Plotiniennes* (II), 59
- Jones (D. M.) 'Double Zeugma' in Tacitus, 12
- Jones (W. H. S.) on Edelstein's *The Hippocratic Oath*, 14
- Jones's (C. W.) *Beda's Opera de Temporibus*, 22
- Kennedy's *Martial and Pliny*, 26
- Kinchin Smith and Melliush's *Catullus*, 26
- King and Laistner's *A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts*, 20
- Kleberg's *Catalogus Codicum Graecorum et Latinorum Bibliothecae Gotoburgensis*, 81
- Knight's *Roman Vergil*, 16
- Knox's *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity*, 62
- Laistner and King's *A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts*, 20
- Lee's *The Elements of Roman Law*, 82
- Linforth's *Soul and Sieve in Plato's Gorgias*, 79
- Livingstone's *Plato and Modern Education*, 15
- Lorimer (W. L.) on Kleberg's *Catalogus Codicum Graecorum et Latinorum Bibliothecae Gotoburgensis*, 81
- magical practices in Egypt, 76
- Manson (T. W.) on Metzger's *The Saturday and Sunday Lessons from Luke in the Greek Gospel Lectionary*, 27; on Knox's *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity*, 62
- Marchant and Watson's *New Latin Course* (Part 2), 26
- Mattingly (H.) on Gordon's *A Mysterious Latin Inscription in California*, 81
- Meadows (J. W.) *Pliny on the Smaragdus*, 50

Metzger
Luke
Michig
Minar's
Minns's
Moberl
Muirhe
Law,
Myres
Aesch
Noma
Glam
Oldfath
Vilae
papyri,
Phalaris
Philolog
Pickard
Crow
Xerxe
Plumpe
Prakken
69
Rabin
ence,
Richter
Ridley
Robertso
Robinson
Dodec
Roman
Rose (H
Boegia
Schilling
Sinclair
Sleeman
the En
smaragdu

- Metzger's *The Saturday and Sunday Lessons from Luke in the Greek Gospel Lectionary*, 27
Michigan Papyri (V, VI), 74
 Minar's *Early Pythagorean Politics*, 56
 Minns's *The Art of the Northern Nomads*, 22
 Moberley's *Plato's Conception of Education*, 15
 Muirhead (J. S.) on Lee's *The Elements of Roman Law*, 82
 Myres (J. L.) Blood-feud and Justice in Homer and Aeschylus, 10; on Minns's *The Art of the Northern Nomads*, 22; on Robinson's *The Great Glory and Glamour of the Dodecanese*, 81
 Oldfather's *Studies in the Text Tradition of Jerome's Vitae Patrum*, 27
 papyri, 25, 74
 Phalaris' bull, 39 ff.
Philological Studies in Honor of Walter Miller, 77
 Pickard-Cambridge (A. W.) *The Wheel and the Crown*, 52 (cf. 9); on Broneer's *The Tent of Xerxes and the Greek Theater*, 80
 Plumpe's *Mater Ecclesia*, 27
 Prakken's *Studies in Greek Genealogical Chronology*, 69
 Rabin (C.) on Walzer's *Galen on Medical Experience*, 80
 Richter's *Kouroi*, 71
 Ridley (M. R.) on Eliot's *What is a Classic?*, 64
 Robertson (D. S.) *Boethius Philos. Consol.* 2 1: 12
 Robinson's *The Great Glory and Glamour of the Dodecanese*, 81
 Roman and Hellenic Societies, meeting of, 33
 Rose (H. J.) on Fontenrose's *The Festival called Boegia at Didyma*, 80
 Schilling's *La Veillée de Vénus*, 65
 Sinclair (T. A.) *Bad Bronze again*, 52
 Sleeman (J. H.) on Farquharson's *The Meditations of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus*, 60
 smaragdus, 50
 Smith's *The Hearst Hydria*, 28
 Souter (A.) on Jones's *Bedae Opera de Temporibus*, 22; on Oldfather's *Studies in the Text Tradition of Jerome's Vitae Patrum*, 27
 Stanford (W. B.) Three notes on the *Odyssey*, 38
 Steadman (S. H.) A note on the *Rhesus*, 6
 Stewart (J. A.), πολύτροπος, 11
 SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 29, 82
 Sutherland (C. H. V.) on Toynbee's *Roman Medallions*, 73
 Tacitus, literary reminiscence in, 45 ff.
 Tate (J.) On Greene's *Moirra*, 12; on Livingstone's *Plato and Modern Education*, and Moberley's *Plato's Conception of Education*, 15; on *Essays by Divers Hands*, 29; on Jaeger's *Paideia* (II), 54; on *Yale Classical Studies* (VIII), 76; on Linforth's *Soul and Sieve in Plato's Gorgias*, 79
 Taubenschlag's *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri*, 25
 Thomson (G.) *The Wheel and the Crown*, 9 (cf. 52). three-word hexameters, 38
 Tithonus, 'death' of, 44
 Toynbee's *Roman Medallions*, 73
Transactions of the American Philological Association summarized (LXXIV), 82
Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom, NS vol. XX: 29
 Ure (P. N.) on Davidson and Thompson's *Small Objects from the Pnyx* (I), 28
 Walbank (F. W.) *Phalaris' Bull in Timaeus*, 39 ff.
 Walzer's *Galen on Medical Experience*, 80
 Webster (T. B. L.) on Smith's *The Hearst Hydria*, 28
 Wycherley (R. E.) *Aristophanes Ba.* 1435 ff.: 34 ff.
Yale Classical Studies (VIII), 76
 Youtie and Pearl's *Papyri and Ostraca from Karanis*, 74

II. INDEX LOCORUM

Note:—'passim' means that several passages of the author or work are dealt with at the given place.

Aelian *NA* 4 51: 53
 Aeschylus *Ag.* 390-3: 52; *Eum.* 428-35: 10
 Appian *BC* iv 55: 53
 Apuleius *de deo Socr.* 105: 45
 Aristophanes *Ba.* 1435-53: 34 ff.; *Plu.* 312: 53
 Asius fr. 13, 7 (Kinkel): 39
 Athenaeus xiv 617 F: 5
 Aulus Gellius i 14 I, iii 4 I, vi 1 2: 41

 Boethius *Philos. Cons.* ii 1: 12; iii 5 8: 45

 Cato *Or. frg.* 7: 49
 Cicero *Verr.* ii 4 73: 39, 42; *Or. frg.* A ix 3: 46
 CIG (Boeckh) 3538: 10
 CIL iv 3421: 12 (for CIG in text read CIL)
 Claudian *Bell. Gild.* i 426: 47

 Diodorus Siculus ii 52: 50; xiii 90 4-7: 39 f.; xxi 17: 41

 Euripides *Andr.* 1121: 53; *Cresphontes* fr. (TGF 453 Nauck): 37; *El.* 191: 11; *HF* 839: 53; *Rh.* passim: 6 f.; *Supp.* 244: 37

 Florus *Verg.* p. 183, 18: 47

 Herodian 4 14 6: 53
 Herodotus vii 10: 52
 Hesiod *Th.* 576-7: 9; *Op.* 383: 39; fr. 278, 4: 39
 Homer *Il.* ii 706: 39; x 334 f., 465 f., 526 f., 570 f.: 6; xviii 499 f.: 10; *Od.* viii 167 f.: 38; x 137: 39; x 554 f.: 38; xii 133: 38. *H. Aphr.* 237: 44; *h. Art.* 3: 39; *h. Dem.* 31: 39
 Horace *C.* i 28 7-9: 44; ii 16 29-30: 45

 Julius Solinus 15: 51
 Justin xv 2 3: 49
 Juvenal iii 294 f.: 11; vi 326: 12; xii 168: 12

 Livy passim (in relation to Tacitus): 45 ff.
 Lucan i 393-4: 39; ii 243: 48; iv 176: 47; vi 397: 50; vii 571: 47; viii 538: 47
 Lucilius fr. 331-2 Marx: 12

 Marcus Antoninus passim: 61; vi 13: 53

Octavia 514: 49
 Orphica fr. 32c 6-7 Kern: 9; fr. 230: 9
 Ovid passim (in relation to Tacitus): 45 ff.; *Her.* xi 17 f.: 43; *Met.* xv 839: 42

 Pervigilium Veneris 9, 58, 59-62, 63: 65
 Petronius *Sat.* 85 ff.: 29
 Plato passim: 54 f.; *Apol.* 28 E: 1; *Ep.* 333 E: 10; *Lg.* 653 B, 809 E, 961 A ff.: 4; *Phd.* 84 A: 53; *Phileb.* passim: 58; *Pol.* 282 C, 305 E, 307 C: 3; 308 D-E: 4; *Rp.* 443 D-E: 3; 534 B-C: 2; 537 E ff.: 2; *Soph.* 226 B ff.: 4; 226 D: 3; 231 B-E: 1; *Symp.* 197 B: 53; *Tim.* 87 A: 79
 Pliny *NH* xxxiv 89: 39; xxxvii 62-6: 50 f.
 Pliny *Pan.* ii 3: 48
 Plotinus *Enn.* ii 3 3, 9 17: 53
 Polybius passim: 41; i 15 1-11: 41; xii 25: 39
 Procopius *hist. arc.* xv 25 ff.: 12
 Propertius iii 18: 45

 Quintilian vi 3 83: 11; xii 2 28, 31: 42 f.

 Sallust passim (in relation to Tacitus): 45 ff.
 Schol. Pind. *P.* i 185: 39
 Seneca *Suas.* vi 6: 42
 Seneca *de ben.* vi 18 1: 48; *de prov.* 5 8: 49; *Epp.* 36 1, 40 7: 66; 88 3: 43; *Helv.* 19 4: 49; *Med.* 900: 47; *Phoen.* 648-9: 49
 Silius Italicus viii 225: 43; ix 356-7: 46; xi 213-14: 49; xi 255-6: 45; xiii 154: 50
 Statius *S.* ii 1 3: 46; v 2 58-9: 47; *Theb.* i 194: 48; i 252-3: 50; iv 408: 46; xii 331-2: 50
 Strabo 799, 825: 11

 Tacitus passim: 45 ff.; *H.* ii 92 10: 12
 Theo Smyrn. *Math.* p. 14 Hiller: 10
 Theocritus *Ep.* 18: 5 ff.
 [Theocritus] *Id.* xxiii 53 f.: 53
 Theognis 417 f., 449 f.: 52
 Theophrastus *de lap.* 24: 51; 45: 52

 Valerius Maximus v 1 6: 42
 Velleius Paterculus i 12 1: 48; ii 16 2: 50; ii 30 6: 50; ii 32 3: 49; ii 38 6: 50; ii 127 3: 47
 Virgil passim (in relation to Tacitus): 45 ff.; *Aen.* iv 247: 11; vii 684: 11

III. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

ἄγραφος γάμος, 25	Δωρίς (Δωρική) διάλεκτος, 5	ἰστοურγία, 53	παρὰτρίβειν, παρὰτρίμυς, 52
ἀμύητος, 79	ἔγγραφος γάμος, 25	καθαρμός, 3	πηνίον, 11
ἀνεξέταστος βίος, 1 ff.	ἐκδόσιμα, 75	κῆλη, 12	πολύπηνος, 11
ἀπιστία, 79	ἔλεγχος, 1	κύκλος, 9 (cf. 52)	στέφανος, 9 (cf. 53)
βραβεῖον, 10	ἐμβατεία, ἐμβατεύω, 10 (cf. 53)	λακκοσχέας, 12	σῶμα σῆμα, 79
γενεά, 69	ἐξέταστος, 3	λόγος, 63	ταλασιουργία, 3
Δέρρις (Δέρρον, Δέρρα), 11	ἐπιβαίνω 'to attain to', 9	Λυδία λίθος, 52	φθόνος (of black magic), 76
διακριτική τέχνη, 4	ἐποπτεία, 9	Λύδιος, 5	Φρύγιος, 5
Δώριος, 5		Λύκειος, Λύκιος, 8	
		μελαμπαγής, 52	

e.

er. xi

E: 10;

: 53;

C: 3;

C: 2;

B-E:

; *Epp.*
; *Med.*

13-14;

04: 48;

o 6: 50;

Aen. iv

ἀνθρώποις,

)

magic),